

**THE WATER QUALITY CONTROL PLAN (BASIN PLAN)
FOR THE
CALIFORNIA REGIONAL WATER QUALITY CONTROL BOARD
CENTRAL VALLEY REGION**

FOURTH EDITION - 1998

**THE SACRAMENTO RIVER BASIN AND
THE SAN JOAQUIN RIVER BASIN**



**CALIFORNIA REGIONAL WATER QUALITY CONTROL BOARD
CENTRAL VALLEY REGION**

**Ed J. Schnabel, Chair
Steven Butler, Vice Chair
Charles Ahlem
Jane Papazian
Craig Pedersen
William Porter
John Sharrah
Patricia M. Smith
Clifford C. Wisdom**

Gary M. Carlton, Executive Officer

COVER PHOTO ACKNOWLEDGMENTS:

Rafting the American River: Rapid Shooters, Lotus CA
Yosemite: David Rosen/ Ducks Unlimited

Sunset Waterfowl: David Rosen/ Ducks Unlimited
Sugar Beets: Brenda Grewell/ Dept. of Water Resources

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
FOREWORD	i-1
Chapter I: INTRODUCTION	I-1
Basin Description.....	I-1
Sacramento River Basin.....	I-1
San Joaquin River Basin.....	I-1
Grassland Watershed.....	I-2
Chapter II: EXISTING AND POTENTIAL BENEFICIAL USES	II-1
Beneficial Use Definitions.....	II-1
Surface Water Beneficial Uses.....	II-2
Ground Water Beneficial Uses.....	II-2
Chapter III: WATER QUALITY OBJECTIVES	III-1
Water Quality Objectives for Inland Surface Waters.....	III-2
Bacteria.....	III-3
Biostimulatory Substances.....	III-3
Chemical Constituents.....	III-3
Color.....	III-5
Dissolved Oxygen.....	III-5
Floating Material.....	III-5
Oil and Grease.....	III-5
pH.....	III-5
Pesticides.....	III-6
Radioactivity.....	III-6
Salinity.....	III-6
Sediment.....	III-7
Settleable Material.....	III-7
Suspended Material.....	III-7

TABLE OF CONTENTS (continued)

	PAGE
Tastes and Odors.....	III-7
Temperature	III-8
Toxicity	III-8
Turbidity.....	III-9
Water Quality Objectives for Ground Waters.....	III-9
Bacteria	III-9
Chemical Constituents	III-9
Radioactivity	III-10
Tastes and Odors	III-10
Toxicity	III-10
Chapter IV: IMPLEMENTATION	IV-1
Water Quality Concerns.....	IV-1
Agriculture	IV-2
Irrigated Agriculture	IV-2
Agricultural Support Activities.....	IV-3
Animal Confinement Operations	IV-3
Silviculture.....	IV-3
Municipalities and Industries.....	IV-3
Storm Water.....	IV-4
Mineral Exploration and Extraction.....	IV-4
Hazardous and Non-Hazardous Waste Disposal	IV-5
Contaminated Sites Threatening Ground Water Quality	IV-6
Other Discharge Activities.....	IV-6
Water Bodies with Special Water Quality Problems.....	IV-7
The Nature of Control Actions Implemented by the Regional Water Board	IV-7
Control Action Considerations of the State Water Board.....	IV-8

TABLE OF CONTENTS (continued)

	<u>PAGE</u>
Policies and Plans.....	IV-8
Programs	IV-10
Management Agency Agreements, Memorandum of Agreement, and Memoranda of Understanding.....	IV-12
Control Action Considerations of the Regional Water Board	IV-14
Policies and Plans.....	IV-14
Memoranda of Understanding and Agreement.....	IV-21
Waivers	IV-22
Prohibitions	IV-23
Guidelines	IV-26
Nonpoint Source Action Plans.....	IV-26
Actions Recommended for Implementation by Other Entities.....	IV-27
Recommended for Implementation by the State Water Board	IV-27
Interbasin Transfer of Water	IV-27
Trans-Delta Water Conveyance	IV-28
Water Quality Planning.....	IV-28
Water Intake Studies	IV-28
Subsurface Agricultural Drainage.....	IV-28
Recommended for Implementation by Other Agencies.....	IV-29
Water Resources Facilities.....	IV-29
Agricultural Drainage Facilities.....	IV-29
Subsurface Agricultural Drainage.....	IV-29
Continuous Planning for Implementation of Water Quality Control.....	IV-30
Actions and Schedule to Achieve Water Quality Objectives	IV-30
Agricultural Drainage Discharges in the San Joaquin River Basin	IV-30
Assessment of Biototoxicity of Major Point and Nonpoint Source Discharges in the Sacramento River and San Joaquin River Basins	IV-32

TABLE OF CONTENTS (continued)

	PAGE
Heavy Metals From Point and Nonpoint Sources.....	IV-32
Mercury Discharges in the Sacramento River and San Joaquin River Basins.....	IV-33
Pesticide Discharges from Nonpoint Sources.....	IV-33
Dredging in the Sacramento River and San Joaquin River Basins.....	IV-36
Nitrate Pollution of Ground Water in the Sacramento and San Joaquin River Basins	IV-36
Temperature and Turbidity Increases Below Large Water Storage and Diversion Projects in the Sacramento River Basin.....	IV-36
Beneficial Use Impairments from Logging, Construction, and Associated Activities.....	IV-37
Dairies.....	IV-37
Nutrient and Pesticide Discharges From Nurseries	IV-37
Estimated Costs of Agricultural Water Quality Control Programs and Potential Sources of Financing	IV-38
San Joaquin River Subsurface Agricultural Drainage Control Program	IV-38
Pesticide Control Program.....	IV-38
Chapter V: SURVEILLANCE AND MONITORING	V-1
Data Collected by Other Agencies.....	V-1
Regional Water Board and State Water Board Monitoring Programs.....	V-1
Special Studies	V-1
Aerial Surveillance.....	V-2
Self-Monitoring.....	V-2
Compliance Monitoring	V-2
Complaint Investigation.....	V-2

APPENDIX

MAPS

FOREWORD TO THE FOURTH EDITION (1998)

The preparation and adoption of water quality control plans (Basin Plans) is required by the California Water Code (Section 13240) and supported by the Federal Clean Water Act. Section 303 of the Clean Water Act requires states to adopt water quality standards which "consist of the designated uses of the navigable waters involved and the water quality criteria for such waters based upon such uses."

According to Section 13050 of the California Water Code, Basin Plans consist of a designation or establishment for the waters within a specified area of beneficial uses to be protected, water quality objectives to protect those uses, and a program of implementation needed for achieving the objectives. State law also requires that Basin Plans conform to the policies set forth in the Water Code beginning with Section 13000 and any state policy for water quality control. Since beneficial uses, together with their corresponding water quality objectives, can be defined per federal regulations as water quality standards, the Basin Plans are regulatory references for meeting the state and federal requirements for water quality control (40 CFR 131.20). One significant difference between the state and federal programs is that California's basin plans establish standards for ground waters in addition to surface waters.

Basin Plans are adopted and amended by Regional Water Boards under a structured process involving full public participation and state environmental review. Basin Plans and amendments thereto, do not become effective until approved by the State Water Resources Control Board (State Water Board). Regulatory provisions must be approved by the Office of Administrative Law. Adoption or revision of surface water standards are subject to the approval of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency.

Basin Plans complement water quality control plans adopted by the State Water Board, such as the Water Quality Control Plans for Temperature Control and Ocean Waters. It is the intent of the State and Regional Water Boards to maintain the Basin Plans in an updated and readily available edition that reflects the current water quality control program.

This Basin Plan covers the entire Sacramento and San Joaquin River Basins. A separate Basin Plan covers the Tulare Lake Basin. The Basin Plan was first adopted in 1975. In 1989, a second edition was published. The second edition incorporated all the

amendments which were adopted and approved since 1975, updated the Basin Plan to include new state policies and programs, restructured and edited the Basin Plan for clarity, and incorporated the results of triennial reviews conducted in 1984 and 1987. The Third Edition - 1994 incorporated all amendments approved between 1989 and 1994, included new state policies and programs, edited and restructured the Basin Plan to make it consistent with other regional and state plans, and substantively amended sections dealing with beneficial uses, objectives, and implementation programs. The current edition (Fourth Edition - 1998) incorporates two new amendments approved since 1994. One amendment deals with compliance schedules in permits and the other addresses agricultural subsurface drainage discharges.

In this Basin Plan, "Regional Water Board" refers to the Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board and "State Water Board" refers to the State Water Resources Control Board.

BASIN DESCRIPTION

This Basin Plan covers the entire area included in the Sacramento and San Joaquin River drainage basins (see maps in pocket* and Figure II-1). The basins are bound by the crests of the Sierra Nevada on the east and the Coast Range and Klamath Mountains on the west. They extend some 400 miles from the California - Oregon border southward to the headwaters of the San Joaquin River.

*NOTE: The planning boundary between the San Joaquin River Basin and the Tulare Lake Basin follows the northern boundary of Little Panoche Creek basin, continues eastward along the channel of the San Joaquin River to Millerton Lake in the Sierra Nevada foothills, and then follows along the southern boundary of the San Joaquin River drainage basin.

The Sacramento River and San Joaquin River Basins cover about one fourth of the total area of the State and over 30% of the State's irrigable land. The Sacramento and San Joaquin Rivers furnish roughly 51% of the State's water supply. Surface water from the two drainage basins meet and form the Delta, which ultimately drains to San Francisco Bay. Two major water projects, the Federal Central Valley Project and the State Water Project, deliver water from the Delta to Southern California, the San Joaquin Valley, Tulare Lake Basin, the San Francisco Bay area, as well as within the Delta boundaries.

The Delta is a maze of river channels and diked islands covering roughly 1,150 square miles, including 78 square miles of water area. The legal boundary of the Delta is described in Section 12220 of the Water Code (also see Figure III-1 of this Basin Plan).

Ground water is defined as subsurface water that occurs beneath the ground surface in fully saturated zones within soils and other geologic formations. Where ground water occurs in a saturated geologic unit that contains sufficient permeability and thickness to yield significant quantities of water to wells or springs, it can be defined as an aquifer (USGS, Water Supply Paper 1988, 1972). A ground water basin is defined as a hydrogeologic unit containing one large aquifer or several connected and interrelated aquifers (Todd, *Groundwater Hydrology*, 1980).

Major ground water basins underlie both valley floors, and there are scattered smaller basins in the foothill areas and mountain valleys. In many parts of the Region, usable ground waters occur outside of these currently identified basins. There are water-bearing geologic units within ground water basins in the Region that do not meet the definition of an aquifer. Therefore, for basin planning and regulatory purposes, the term "ground water" includes all subsurface waters that occur in fully saturated zones and fractures within soils and other geologic formations, whether or not these waters meet the definition of an aquifer or occur within identified ground water basins.

Sacramento River Basin

The Sacramento River Basin covers 27,210 square miles and includes the entire area drained by the Sacramento River. For planning purposes, this includes all watersheds tributary to the Sacramento River that are north of the Cosumnes River watershed. It also includes the closed basin of Goose Lake and drainage sub-basins of Cache and Putah Creeks.

The principal streams are the Sacramento River and its larger tributaries: the Pit, Feather, Yuba, Bear, and American Rivers to the east; and Cottonwood, Stony, Cache, and Putah Creeks to the west. Major reservoirs and lakes include Shasta, Oroville, Folsom, Clear Lake, and Lake Berryessa.

DWR Bulletin 118-80 identifies 63 ground water basins in the Sacramento watershed area. The Sacramento Valley floor is divided into 2 ground water basins. Other basins are in the foothills or mountain valleys. There are areas other than those identified in the DWR Bulletin with ground waters that have beneficial uses.

San Joaquin River Basin

The San Joaquin River Basin covers 15,880 square miles and includes the entire area drained by the San Joaquin River. It includes all watersheds tributary to the San Joaquin River and the Delta south of the Sacramento River and south of the American River watershed. The southern planning boundary is described in the first paragraph of the previous page.

The principal streams in the basin are the San Joaquin River and its larger tributaries: the Cosumnes, Mokelumne, Calaveras, Stanislaus, Tuolumne, Merced, Chowchilla, and Fresno Rivers. Major reservoirs and lakes include Pardee, New Hogan, Millerton, McClure, Don Pedro, and New Melones.

DWR Bulletin 118-80 identifies 39 ground water basins in the San Joaquin watershed area. The San Joaquin Valley floor is divided into 15 separate ground water basins, largely based on political considerations. Other basins are in the foothills or mountain valleys. There are areas other than those identified in the DWR Bulletin with ground waters that have beneficial uses.

Grassland Watershed

The Grassland watershed is a valley floor sub-basin of the San Joaquin River Basin. The portion of the watershed for which agricultural subsurface drainage policies and regulations apply covers an area of approximately 370,000 acres and is bounded on the north by the alluvial fan of Orestimba Creek and by the Tulare Lake Basin to the south. The San Joaquin River forms the eastern boundary and Interstate Highway 5 forms the approximate western boundary. The San Joaquin River forms a wide flood plain in the region of the Grassland watershed.

The hydrology of the watershed has been irreversibly altered due to water projects and is presently governed by land uses. These uses are primarily, managed wetlands and agriculture. The wetlands form important waterfowl habitat for migratory waterfowl using the Pacific Flyway. The alluvial fans of the western and southern portions of the watershed contain salts and selenium which can be mobilized through irrigation practices and can impact beneficial uses of surface waters and wetlands if not properly regulated.

II. EXISTING AND POTENTIAL BENEFICIAL USES

Beneficial uses are critical to water quality management in California. State law defines beneficial uses of California's waters that may be protected against quality degradation to include (and not be limited to) "...domestic; municipal; agricultural and industrial supply; power generation; recreation; aesthetic enjoyment; navigation; and preservation and enhancement of fish, wildlife, and other aquatic resources or preserves" (Water Code Section 13050(f)). Protection and enhancement of existing and potential beneficial uses are primary goals of water quality planning.

Significant points concerning the concept of beneficial uses are:

1. All water quality problems can be stated in terms of whether there is water of sufficient quantity or quality to protect or enhance beneficial uses.
2. Beneficial uses do not include all of the reasonable uses of water. For example, disposal of wastewaters is not included as a beneficial use. This is not to say that disposal of wastewaters is a prohibited use of waters of the State; it is merely a use which cannot be satisfied to the detriment of beneficial uses. Similarly, the use of water for the dilution of salts is not a beneficial use although it may, in some cases, be a reasonable and desirable use of water.
3. The protection and enhancement of beneficial uses require that certain quality and quantity objectives be met for surface and ground waters.
4. Fish, plants, and other wildlife, as well as humans, use water beneficially.

Beneficial use designation (and water quality objectives, see Chapter III) must be reviewed at least once during each three-year period for the purpose of modification as appropriate (40 CFR 131.20).

The beneficial uses, and abbreviations, listed below are standard basin plan designations.

Municipal and Domestic Supply (MUN) - Uses of water for community, military, or individual water

supply systems including, but not limited to, drinking water supply.

Agricultural Supply (AGR) - Uses of water for farming, horticulture, or ranching including, but not limited to, irrigation (including leaching of salts), stock watering, or support of vegetation for range grazing.

Industrial Service Supply (IND) - Uses of water for industrial activities that do not depend primarily on water quality including, but not limited to, mining, cooling water supply, hydraulic conveyance, gravel washing, fire protection, or oil well repressurization.

Industrial Process Supply (PRO) - Uses of water for industrial activities that depend primarily on water quality.

Ground Water Recharge (GWR) - Uses of water for natural or artificial recharge of ground water for purposes of future extraction, maintenance of water quality, or halting of saltwater intrusion into freshwater aquifers.

Freshwater Replenishment (FRSH) - Uses of water for natural or artificial maintenance of surface water quantity or quality.

Navigation (NAV) - Uses of water for shipping, travel, or other transportation by private, military, or commercial vessels.

Hydropower Generation (POW) - Uses of water for hydropower generation.

Water Contact Recreation (REC-1) - Uses of water for recreational activities involving body contact with water, where ingestion of water is reasonably possible. These uses include, but are not limited to, swimming, wading, water-skiing, skin and scuba diving, surfing, white water activities, fishing, or use of natural hot springs.

Non-contact Water Recreation (REC-2) - Uses of water for recreational activities involving proximity to water, but where there is generally no body contact with water, nor any likelihood of ingestion of water. These uses include, but are not limited to, picnicking, sunbathing, hiking, beachcombing, camping, boating, tidepool and marine life study, hunting, sightseeing,

or aesthetic enjoyment in conjunction with the above activities.

Commercial and Sport Fishing (COMM) - Uses of water for commercial or recreational collection of fish, shellfish, or other organisms including, but not limited to, uses involving organisms intended for human consumption or bait purposes.

Aquaculture (AQUA) - Uses of water for aquaculture or mariculture operations including, but not limited to, propagation, cultivation, maintenance, or harvesting of aquatic plants and animals for human consumption or bait purposes.

Warm Freshwater Habitat (WARM) - Uses of water that support warm water ecosystems including, but not limited to, preservation or enhancement of aquatic habitats, vegetation, fish, or wildlife, including invertebrates.

Cold Freshwater Habitat (COLD) - Uses of water that support cold water ecosystems including, but not limited to, preservation or enhancement of aquatic habitats, vegetation, fish, or wildlife, including invertebrates.

Estuarine Habitat (EST) - Uses of water that support estuarine ecosystems including, but not limited to, preservation or enhancement of estuarine habitats, vegetation, fish, shellfish, or wildlife (e.g., estuarine mammals, waterfowl, shorebirds).

Wildlife Habitat (WILD) - Uses of water that support terrestrial or wetland ecosystems including, but not limited to, preservation and enhancement of terrestrial habitats or wetlands, vegetation, wildlife (e.g., mammals, birds, reptiles, amphibians, invertebrates), or wildlife water and food sources.

Preservation of Biological Habitats of Special Significance (BIOL) - Uses of water that support designated areas or habitats, such as established refuges, parks, sanctuaries, ecological reserves, or Areas of Special Biological Significance (ASBS), where the preservation or enhancement of natural resources requires special protection.

Rare, Threatened, or Endangered Species (RARE) - Uses of water that support aquatic habitats necessary, at least in part, for the survival and successful maintenance of plant or animal species established under state or federal law as rare, threatened or endangered.

Migration of Aquatic Organisms (MIGR) - Uses of water that support habitats necessary for migration or other temporary activities by aquatic organisms, such as anadromous fish.

Spawning, Reproduction, and/or Early Development (SPWN) - Uses of water that support high quality aquatic habitats suitable for reproduction and early development of fish.

Shellfish Harvesting (SHELL) - Uses of water that support habitats suitable for the collection of filter-feeding shellfish (e.g., clams, oysters, and mussels) for human consumption, commercial, or sports purposes.

Surface Waters

Existing and potential beneficial uses which currently apply to surface waters of the basins are presented in Figure II-1 and Table II-1. The beneficial uses of any specifically identified water body generally apply to its tributary streams. In some cases a beneficial use may not be applicable to the entire body of water. In these cases the Regional Water Board's judgment will be applied.

It should be noted that it is impractical to list every surface water body in the Region. For unidentified water bodies, the beneficial uses will be evaluated on a case-by-case basis.

Water Bodies within the basins that do not have beneficial uses designated in Table II-1 are assigned MUN designations in accordance with the provisions of State Water Board Resolution No. 88-63 which is, by reference, a part of this Basin Plan. These MUN designations in no way affect the presence or absence of other beneficial use designations in these water bodies.

In making any exemptions to the beneficial use designation of MUN, the Regional Board will apply the exceptions listed in Resolution 88-63 (Appendix Item 8).

Ground Waters

Beneficial uses of ground waters of the basins are presented below. For the purposes of assigning beneficial uses, the term ground water is defined in Chapter I.

Unless otherwise designated by the Regional Water Board, all ground waters in the Region are considered as suitable or potentially suitable, at a minimum, for municipal and domestic water supply (MUN), agricultural supply (AGR), industrial service supply (IND), and industrial process supply (PRO).

In making any exceptions to the beneficial use designation of municipal and domestic supply (MUN), the Regional Water Board will apply the criteria in State Water Board Resolution No. 88-63, 'Sources of Drinking Water Policy'. The criteria for exceptions are:

- "The total dissolved solids (TDS) exceed 3,000 mg/l (5,000 µhos/cm, electrical conductivity) and it is not reasonably expected by the Regional Water Board [for the ground water] to supply a public water system, or
- "There is contamination, either by natural processes or by human activity (unrelated to a specific pollution incident), that cannot reasonably be treated for domestic use using either Best Management Practices or best economically achievable treatment practices, or
- "The water source does not provide sufficient water to supply a single well capable of producing an average, sustained yield of 200 gallons per day, or
- "The aquifer is regulated as a geothermal energy producing source or has been exempted administratively pursuant to 40 CFR, Section 146.4 for the purpose of underground injection of fluids associated with the production of hydrocarbon or geothermal energy, provided that these fluids do not constitute a hazardous waste under 40 CFR Section 261.3."

To be consistent with State Water Board Resolution No. 88-63 in making exceptions to beneficial use designations other than municipal and domestic supply (MUN), the Regional Water Board will consider criteria for exceptions, parallel to Resolution

No. 88-63 exception criteria, which would indicate limitations on those other beneficial uses as follows:

In making any exceptions to the beneficial use designation of agricultural supply (AGR), the Regional Water Board will consider the following criteria:

- There is pollution, either by natural processes or by human activity (unrelated to a specific pollution incident), that cannot reasonably be treated for agricultural use using either Best Management Practices or best economically achievable treatment practices, or
- The water source does not provide sufficient water to supply a single well capable of producing an average, sustained yield of 200 gallons per day, or
- The aquifer is regulated as a geothermal energy producing source or has been exempted administratively pursuant to 40 CFR, Section 146.4 for the purpose of underground injection of fluids associated with the production of hydrocarbon or geothermal energy, provided that these fluids do not constitute a hazardous waste under 40 CFR Section 261.3.

In making any exceptions to the beneficial use designation of industrial supply (IND or PRO), the Regional Water Board will consider the following criteria:

- There is pollution, either by natural processes or by human activity (unrelated to a specific pollution incident), that cannot reasonably be treated for industrial use using either Best Management Practices or best economically achievable treatment practices, or
- The water source does not provide sufficient water to supply a single well capable of producing an average, sustained yield of 200 gallons per day.

FIGURE II-1




TABLE II-1

SURFACE WATER BODIES AND BENEFICIAL USES

	SURFACE WATER BODIES (1)	HYDRO UNIT NUMBER	MUN	AGRI-CULTURE		INDUSTRY			RECREATION			FRESHWATER HABITAT (2)		MIGRATION		SPAWNING		WILD	NAV
				AGR	STOCK WATERING	PROC	IND	POW	REC-1	REC-2	WARM	COLD	MIGR	COLD (4)	WARM (3)	COLD (4)			
1	McCLOUD RIVER	505.	E																
2	GOOSE LAKE	527.20	E	E	E				E	E	E	E	E			E	E	E	
3	PIT RIVER																		
3	NORTH FORK, SOUTH FORK, PIT RIVER	526.00	E	E	E				E	E	E	E	E			E	E	E	
4	CONFLUENCE OF FORKS TO HAT CREEK	526.35	E	E	E				E	E	E	E	E			E	E	E	
5	FALL RIVER	526.41	E	E	E				E	E	E	E	E			E	E	E	
6	HAT CREEK	526.30		E					E	E	E	E	E			E	E	E	
7	BAUM LAKE	526.34							E	E	E	E	E			E	E	E	
8	MOUTH OF HAT CREEK TO SHASTA LAKE	526.	E	E	E				E	E	E	E	E			E	E	E	
9	SACRAMENTO RIVER																		
9	SOURCE TO BOX CANYON RESERVOIR	525.22		E	E				E	E	E	E	E			E	E	E	
10	LAKE SISKIYOU	525.22							E	E	E	E	E			E	E	E	
11	BOX CANYON DAM TO SHASTA LAKE	525.2		E	E				E	E	E	E	E			E	E	E	
12	SHASTA LAKE	506.10	E	E	E				E	E	E	E	E			E	E	E	
13	SHASTA DAM TO COLUSA BASIN DRAIN		E	E	E		E		E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E
14	WHISKEY TOWN RESERVOIR	524.61	E	E	E				E	E	E	E	E			E	E	E	
15	CLEAR CREEK BELOW WHISKEYTOWN RESERVOIR	524.62	E	E	E				E	E	E	E	E			E	E	E	
16	COW CREEK	507.3	P	E	E				E	E	E	E	E			E	E	E	
17	BATTLE CREEK	507.12		E	E				E	E	E	E	E			E	E	E	
18	COTTONWOOD CREEK	524.3	E	E	E	P	P	P	E	E	E	E	E			E	E	E	
19	ANTELOPE CREEK	509.63	E	E	E				E	E	E	E	E			E	E	E	
20	MILL CREEK	509.42	E	E	E				E	E	E	E	E			E	E	E	
21	THOMES CREEK	523.10		E	E			P	E	E	E	E	E			E	E	E	
22	DEER CREEK	509.20	E	E	E				E	E	E	E	E			E	E	E	
23	BIG CHICO CREEK	509.14		E	E				E	E	E	E	E			E	E	E	
24	STONY CREEK	522.00		E	E				E	E	E	E	E			E	E	E	
25	EAST PARK RESERVOIR	522.33							E	E	E	E	E			E	E	E	
26	BLACK BUTTE RESERVOIR	522.12		E	E				E	E	E	E	E	P		E	E	E	
27	BUTTE CREEK																		
27	SOURCES TO CHICO	521.30	E	E	E			E	E			E	E		E	E	E	E	
28	BELOW CHICO, INCLUDING BUTTE SLOUGH	520.40		E	E				E	E		E	E		E	E	E	E	
29	COLUSA BASIN DRAIN	520.21		E	E				E	E		E	E	P	E	E	E	E	

LEGEND

E = EXISTING BENEFICIAL USES
P = POTENTIAL BENEFICIAL USES
L = EXISTING LIMITED BENEFICIAL USE

NOTE:

Surface waters with the beneficial uses of Groundwater Recharge (GWR), Freshwater Replenishment (FRSH), and Preservation of Rare and Endangered Species (RARE) have not been identified in this plan. Surface waters of the Sacramento and San Joaquin River Basins falling within these beneficial use categories will be identified in the future as part of the continuous planning process to be conducted by the State Water Resources Control Board.

TABLE II-1 (cont'd)

SURFACE WATER BODIES AND BENEFICIAL USES

	SURFACE WATER BODIES (1)	HYDRO UNIT NUMBER	MUN	AGRI-CULTURE		INDUSTRY			RECREATION		FRESH-WATER HABITAT (2)		MIGRATION		SPAWNING		WILD	NA
				AGR	STOCK WATERING	PROC	IND	POW	REC-1	REC-2	WARM	COLD	MIGR	SPWN				
			MUNICIPAL AND DOMESTIC SUPPLY	IRRIGATION					CONTACT	CANOEING (1) AND RAFTING	OTHER NONCONTACT						WILDLIFE HABITAT	NAVIGATION
30	COLUSA BASIN DRAIN TO EYE [1] STREET BRIDGE	520.00	E	E					E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E
31	SUTTER BYPASS	520.3	E	E					E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E
32	FEATHER RIVER																	
32	LAKE ALMANOR	518.41	E	E					E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E
33	NORTH FORK, FEATHER RIVER	518.4	E						E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E
33	MIDDLE FORK, FEATHER RIVER	518.3							E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E
34	SOURCE TO LITTLE LAST CHANCE CREEK	518.35		E	E				E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E
35	FRENCHMAN RESERVOIR	518.36							E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E
36	LITTLE LAST CHANCE CREEK TO LAKE OROVILLE	518.3	E						E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E
37	LAKE DAVIS	518.34							E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E
38	LAKES BASIN LAKES	518.5							E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E
39	LAKE OROVILLE	518.12	E	E					E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E
40	FISH BARRIER DAM TO SACRAMENTO RIVER	515.	E	E					E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E
40	YUBA RIVER																	
41	SOURCES TO ENGLEBRIGHT RESERVOIR	517.	E	E	E				E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E
42	ENGLEBRIGHT DAM TO FEATHER RIVER	515.3		E	E				E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E
43	BEAR RIVER	515.1	E	E	E				E	E	E	E	E	E	P	P	P	E
43	AMERICAN RIVER																	
44	NORTH FORK, SOURCE TO FOLSOM LAKE	514.5	E	E	E				E	E	E	E	P	E		E	E	E
45	MIDDLE FORK, SOURCE TO FOLSOM LAKE	514.4	E	E	E				E	E	E	E	P	E		E	E	E
46	DESOLATION VALLEY LAKES	514.4							E		E		P	E		E	E	E
47	SOUTH FORK	514.3																
48	SOURCE TO PLACERVILLE	514.3	E						E	E	E	P	E			E	E	E
49	PLACERVILLE TO FOLSOM LAKE	514.32	E	E	E				E	E	E	E	E	E		E	E	E
50	FOLSOM LAKE	514.23	E	E	E		P		E	E	E	E	E	E		E	E	E
51	FOLSOM DAM TO SACRAMENTO RIVER	519.21	E	E	E		E		E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E
52	YOLO BYPASS	510.		E	E				E	E	E	E	E	P	E	E	E	E
53	CACHE CREEK	513.52	E	E	E				E	E	E	E	P			E	E	E
54	CLEAR LAKE																	
54	CLEAR LAKE TO YOLO BYPASS	511/513	E	E	E	E	E		E	E	E	E	P			E	E	E

- (1) Shown for streams and rivers only with the implication that certain flows are required for this beneficial use.
 (2) Resident does not include anadromous. Any Segments with both COLD and WARM beneficial use designations will be considered COLD water bodies for the application of water quality objectives.
 (3) Striped bass, sturgeon, and shad.

- (4) Salmon and steelhead
 (5) As a primary beneficial use.
 (6) The indicated beneficial uses are to be protected for all waters except in specific cases where evidence indicates the appropriateness of additional or alternative beneficial use designations.
 (7) Sport fishing is the only recreation activity permitted.

- (8) Beneficial uses vary throughout the Delta and will be evaluated on a case-by-case basis.
 (9) Per State Board Resolution No. 90-28, Marsh Creek and Marsh Creek Reservoir in Contra Costa County are assigned the following beneficial uses: REC1 and REC2

A/ Hidden Reservoir = Hensley Lake
 B/ Buchanan Reservoir = Eastman Lake

TABLE II-1 (cont'd)

SURFACE WATER BODIES AND BENEFICIAL USES

	SURFACE WATER BODIES (1)	HYDRO UNIT NUMBER	MUN MUNICIPAL AND DOMESTIC SUPPLY	AGRI- CULTURE		INDUSTRY			RECREATION			FRESH-WATER HABITAT (2)		MIGRATION		SPAWNING		WILD WILDLIFE HABITAT	NAV NAVIGATION
				IRRIGATION	STOCK WATERING	PROCESS	SERVICE SUPPLY	POWER	REC-1		REC-2 OTHER NONCONTACT	WARM	COLD	MIGR		SPWN			
									CANOEING (1) AND RAFTING					WARM (3)	COLD (4)	WARM (3)	COLD (4)		
55	PUTAH CREEK	512.21	E	E	E			P	E		E	E	E			E		E	
56	LAKE BERRYESSA	510/511	E	E	E				E		E	E	E			E		E	
	LAKE BERRYESSA TO YOLO BYPASS		E	E	E				E		E	E	E			E		E	
	OTHER LAKES AND RESERVOIRS IN SACRAMENTO R. BASIN 5A (6)		E	E	E	E		E	E		E	E	E			E		E	
	COSUMNES RIVER																		
57	SOURCES TO NASHVILLE RESERVOIR (PROPOSED)	532.	E	E					E		E		E			E		E	
58	NASHVILLE RESERVOIR (PROPOSED)	532.	P					P	P		P	P	P	P		P	P	P	
59	SOURCE TO DELTA	531/532	E	E	E				E		E	E	E	E		E	E	E	
	WOKELUMNE RIVER																		
60	SOURCES TO PARDEE RESERVOIR	532.6	E					E	E	E	E	E	E	E		E	E	E	
61	PARDEE RESERVOIR (7)	532.6	E					E	E	E	E	E	E	E		E	E	E	
62	CAMANCHE RESERVOIR	531.2	E	E	E				E		E	E	E	E		E	E	E	
63	CAMANCHE RESERVOIR TO DELTA	531.2		E	E				E	E	E	E	E	E		E	E	E	
	CALAVERAS RIVER																		
64	SOURCE TO NEW HOGAN RESERVOIR	533.							E	E	E	E	E	E		E	E	E	
65	NEW HOGAN RESERVOIR	533.1							E	E	E	E	E	E		E	E	E	
66	NEW HOGAN RESERVOIR TO DELTA	531.3	E	E	E	P	P		E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	
	OTHER LAKES AND RESERVOIRS IN HYDRO UNIT NOS. 531, 532, 533, 543, 544 (8)		E	E	E	E		E	E		E	E	E			E	E	E	
	SAN JOAQUIN RIVER																		
67	SOURCES TO MILLERTON LAKE	540.	E	E	E			E	E	E	E	E	E					E	
68	MILLERTON LAKE	540.12	P	E	E				E		E	E	P			E		E	
69	FRIANT DAM TO MENDOTA POOL	545.	E	E	E	E			E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	P	E	
70	MENDOTA DAM TO SACK DAM	545.1	P	E	E	E			E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	P	E	
71	SACK DAM TO MOUTH OF MERCED RIVER	535.7	P	E	E	E			E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	P	E	
	FRESNO RIVER																		
72	SOURCE TO HIDDEN RESERVOIR A/	539.31	E	E	E				E		E	E	E					E	
73	HIDDEN RESERVOIR A/	539.32	E	E	E				E		E	E	E					E	
74	HIDDEN RESERVOIR TO SAN JOAQUIN RIVER	545.	P	E	E				E	P	E	E	E					E	
	CHOWCHILLA RIVER																		
75	SOURCE TO BUCHANAN RESERVOIR B/	539.11	E	E	E				E		E	E	E					E	
76	BUCHANAN RESERVOIR B/	539.12	E	E	E				E		E	E	E					E	
77	BUCHANAN DAM TO SAN JOAQUIN RIVER	535/545	P	E	E	E			E	P	E	E	E					E	

(1) Shown for streams and rivers only with the implication that certain flows are required for this beneficial use.

(2) Resident does not include anadromous. Any Segments with both COLD and WARM beneficial use designations will be considered COLD water bodies for the application of water quality objectives.

(3) Striped bass, sturgeon, and shad.

(4) Salmon and steelhead

(5) As a primary beneficial use.

(6) The indicated beneficial uses are to be protected for all waters except in specific cases where evidence indicates the appropriateness of additional or alternative beneficial use designations.

(7) Sport fishing is the only recreation activity permitted.

(8) Beneficial uses vary throughout the Delta and will be evaluated on a case-by-case basis.

(9) Per State Board Resolution No. 90-28, Marsh Creek and Marsh Creek Reservoir in Contra Costa County are assigned the following beneficial uses: REC1 and REC2

A/ Hidden Reservoir = Hensley Lake
B/ Buchanan Reservoir = Eastman Lake

SURFACE WATER BODIES AND BENEFICIAL USES

TABLE II-1 (cont'd)

	SURFACE WATER BODIES (1)	HYDRO UNIT NUMBER	MUN	AGRI-CULTURE		INDUSTRY			RECREATION			FRESH-WATER HABITAT (2)		MIGRATION		SPAWNING		WILD	NA
				AGR	PROC	IND	POW	REC-1		REC-2	WARM	COLD	MIGR	SPWN					
									(1)						(4)		(4)		
			MUNICIPAL AND DOMESTIC SUPPLY	IRRIGATION	STOCK WATERING	PROCESS	SERVICE SUPPLY	POWER	CONTACT	CANOEING AND RAFTING	OTHER NONCONTACT	WARM	COLD	WARM (3)	COLD (4)	WARM (3)	COLD (4)	WILDLIFE HABITAT	NAVIGATION
78	MERCED RIVER																		
79	SOURCE TO McCLURE LAKE	537.	P	E				E	E	E	E	E	E					E	
80	McCLURE LAKE	537.22	P	E				E	E	E	E	E	E					E	
	McSWAIN RESERVOIR	537.1	P	E				E	E	E	E	E	E					E	
81	McSWAIN RESERVOIR TO SAN JOAQUIN RIVER	535.	E		E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	
82	YOSEMITE LAKE	535.9						E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	
83	MOUTH OF MERCED RIVER TO VERNALIS TUOLUMNE RIVER	535/541	P	E	E	E		E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	
84	SOURCE TO [NEW] DON PEDRO RESERVOIR	536.	E	E	E			E	E	E	E	E	E					E	
85	NEW DON PEDRO RESERVOIR	536.32	P	E				E	E	E	E	E	E					E	
86	NEW DON PEDRO DAM TO SAN JOAQUIN RIVER	535.	P	E	E			E	E	E	E	E	E		E	E	E	E	
	STANISLAUS RIVER																		
87	SOURCE TO NEW MELONES RESERVOIR (PROPOSED)	534.	E	E	E			E	E	E	E	E	E					E	
88	NEW MELONES RESERVOIR	534.21	E	E	E			E	E	E	E	E	E					E	
89	TULLOCH RESERVOIR	534.22	P	E	E			E	E	E	E	E	E					E	
90	GOODWIN DAM TO SAN JOAQUIN RIVER	535.	P	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E		E	E	E	E	
91	SAN LUIS RESERVOIR	542.32	E	E	E		E	E		E	E	E	E					E	
92	ONEILL RESERVOIR	541.2	E	E	E			E		E	E	E	E					E	
93	OTHER LAKES AND RESERVOIRS IN SAN JOAQUIN R. BASIN, (EXCLUDING HYDRO UNIT NOS. 531-533, 543, 544) (6)		E					E	E		E	E	E				E	E	
94	CALIFORNIA AQUEDUCT	541.	E	E	E	E	E	E	E		E							E	
95	DELTA-MENDOTA CANAL	541/543	E	E	E			E		E	E	E						E	
	GRASSLAND WATERSHED (a)	541.2							E			E						E	
96	MUD SLOUGH (NORTH)			L (b)	E				E			E						E	
97	SALT SLOUGH			E	E				E			E						E	
98	WETLAND WATER SUPPLY CHANNELS (10)			L (b)	E				E			E						E	
C	SACRAMENTO SAN JOAQUIN DELTA (8, 9)	544.	E		E	E	E	E	E		E	L (c)	E	E	E	E	E	E	E

- (1) Shown for streams and rivers only with the implication that certain flows are required for this beneficial use.
 (2) Resident does not include anadromous. Any Segments with both COLD and WARM beneficial use designations will be considered COLD water bodies for the application of water quality objectives.
 (3) Striped bass, sturgeon, and shad.

- (4) Salmon and steelhead
 (5) As a primary beneficial use.
 (6) The indicated beneficial uses are to be protected for all waters except in specific cases where evidence indicates the appropriateness of additional or alternative beneficial use designations.
 (7) Sport fishing is the only recreation activity permitted.

- (8) Beneficial uses vary throughout the Delta and will be evaluated on a case-by-case basis.
 (9) Per State Board Resolution No. 90-28, Marsh Creek and Marsh Creek Reservoir in Contra Costa County are assigned the following beneficial uses: REC1 and REC2
 (10) Wetland water supply channels for which beneficial uses are designated are defined in Appendix 40

- (a) The following beneficial uses EXIST in addition to those noted in Table II-1

Mud Slough (north): COMM and SHELL
 Salt Slough: COMM, BIOL, and SHELL
 Wetland Water Supply Channels: BIOL

- (b) Elevated natural salt and boron concentrations may limit this use to irrigation of salt and boron tolerant crops. Intermittent low flow conditions may also limit this use
 (c) Wetland channels can sustain aquatic life, but due to fluctuating flow regimes and habitat limitations, may not be suitable for nesting and/or propagation.

III. WATER QUALITY OBJECTIVES

The Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act defines water quality objectives as "...the limits or levels of water quality constituents or characteristics which are established for the reasonable protection of beneficial uses of water or the prevention of nuisance within a specific area" [Water Code Section 13050(h)]. It also requires the Regional Water Board to establish water quality objectives, while acknowledging that it is possible for water quality to be changed to some degree without unreasonably affecting beneficial uses. In establishing water quality objectives, the Regional Water Board must consider, among other things, the following factors:

- Past, present, and probable future beneficial uses;
- Environmental characteristics of the hydrographic unit under consideration, including the quality of water available thereto;
- Water quality conditions that could reasonably be achieved through the coordinated control of all factors which affect water quality in the area;
- Economic considerations;
- The need for developing housing within the region;
- The need to develop and use recycled water. (Water Code Section 13241)

The Federal Clean Water Act requires a state to submit for approval of the Administrator of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (*USEPA*) all new or revised water quality standards which are established for surface and ocean waters. As noted earlier, California water quality standards consist of both beneficial uses (identified in Chapter II) and the water quality objectives based on those uses.

There are **seven important points** that apply to water quality objectives.

The **first point** is that water quality objectives can be revised through the basin plan amendment process. Objectives may apply region-wide or be specific to individual water bodies or parts of water bodies. Site-specific objectives may be developed whenever

the Regional Water Board believes they are appropriate. As indicated previously, federal regulations call for each state to review its water quality standards at least every three years. These Triennial Reviews provide one opportunity to evaluate changing water quality objectives, because they begin with an identification of potential and actual water quality problems, i.e., beneficial use impairments. Since impairments may be associated with water quality objectives being exceeded, the Regional Water Board uses the results of the Triennial Review to implement actions to assess, remedy, monitor, or otherwise address the impairments, as appropriate, in order to achieve objectives and protect beneficial uses. If a problem is found to occur because, for example, a water quality objective is too weak to protect beneficial uses, the Basin Plan should be amended to make the objective more stringent. (Better enforcement of the water quality objectives or adoption of certain policies or redirection of staff and resources may also be proper responses to water quality problems. See the Implementation chapter for further discussion.)

Changes to the objectives can also occur because of new scientific information on the effects of water contaminants. A major source of information is the USEPA which develops data on the effects of chemical and other constituent concentrations on particular aquatic species and human health. Other information sources for data on protection of beneficial uses include the National Academy of Science which has published data on bioaccumulation and the Federal Food and Drug Administration which has issued criteria for unacceptable levels of chemicals in fish and shellfish used for human consumption. The Regional Water Board may make use of those and other state or federal agency information sources in assessing the need for new water quality objectives.

The **second point** is that achievement of the objectives depends on applying them to controllable water quality factors. *Controllable water quality factors* are those actions, conditions, or circumstances resulting from human activities that may influence the quality of the waters of the State, that are subject to the authority of the State Water Board or the Regional Water Board, and that may be reasonably controlled. Controllable factors are not allowed to cause further degradation of water quality in instances where uncontrollable factors have

already resulted in water quality objectives being exceeded. The Regional Water Board recognizes that man made changes that alter flow regimes can affect water quality and impact beneficial uses.

The **third point** is that objectives are to be achieved primarily through the adoption of waste discharge requirements (including permits) and cleanup and abatement orders. When adopting requirements and ordering actions, the Regional Water Board considers the potential impact on beneficial uses within the area of influence of the discharge, the existing quality of receiving waters, and the appropriate water quality objectives. It can then make a finding as to the beneficial uses to be protected within the area of influence of the discharge and establish waste discharge requirements to protect those uses and to meet water quality objectives. The objectives contained in this plan, and any State or Federally promulgated objectives applicable to the basins covered by the plan, are intended to govern the levels of constituents and characteristics in the main water mass unless otherwise designated. They may not apply at or in the immediate vicinity of effluent discharges, but at the edge of the *mixing zone* if areas of dilution or criteria for diffusion or dispersion are defined in the waste discharge specifications.

The **fourth point** is that the Regional Water Board recognizes that immediate compliance with water quality objectives adopted by the Regional Water Board or the State Water Board, or with water quality criteria adopted by the USEPA, may not be feasible in all circumstances. Where the Regional Water Board determines it is infeasible for a discharger to comply immediately with such objectives or criteria, compliance shall be achieved in the shortest practicable period of time (determined by the Regional Water Board), not to exceed ten years after the adoption of applicable objectives or criteria. This policy shall apply to water quality objectives and water quality criteria adopted after the effective date of this amendment to the Basin Plan [25 September 1995].

The **fifth point** is that in cases where water quality objectives are formulated to preserve historic conditions, there may be insufficient data to determine completely the temporal and hydrologic variability representative of historic water quality. When violations of such objectives occur, the Regional Water Board judges the reasonableness of achieving those objectives through regulation of the controllable factors in the areas of concern.

The **sixth point** is that the State Water Board adopts policies and plans for water quality control which can specify water quality objectives or affect their implementation. Chief among the State Water Board's policies for water quality control is State Water Board Resolution No. 68-16 (Statement of Policy with Respect to Maintaining High Quality of Waters in California). It requires that wherever the existing quality of surface or ground waters is better than the objectives established for those waters in a basin plan, the existing quality will be maintained unless as otherwise provided by Resolution No. 68-16 or any revisions thereto. This policy and others establish general objectives. The State Water Board's water quality control plans applicable to the Sacramento and San Joaquin River Basins are the Thermal Plan and Water Quality Control Plan for Salinity. The Thermal Plan and its water quality objectives are in the Appendix. The Water Quality Control Plan for Salinity water quality objectives are listed as Table

III-5. The State Water Board's plans and policies that the Basin Plan must conform to are addressed in Chapter IV, Implementation.

The **seventh point** is that water quality objectives may be in numerical or narrative form. The enumerated milligram-per-liter (mg/l) limit for copper is an example of a numerical objective; the objective for color is an example of a narrative form.

Information on the application of water quality objectives is contained in the section, *Policy for Application of Water Quality Objectives*, in Chapter IV.

WATER QUALITY OBJECTIVES FOR INLAND SURFACE WATERS

The objectives below are presented by categories which, like the Beneficial Uses of Chapter II, were standardized for uniformity among the Regional Water Boards. The water quality objectives apply to all surface waters in the Sacramento and San Joaquin River Basins, including the Delta, or as noted. (*The legal boundary of the Delta is contained in Section 12220 of the Water Code and identified in Figure III-1.*) The numbers in parentheses following specific water bodies are keyed to Figure II-1.

Bacteria

In waters designated for contact recreation (REC-1), the fecal coliform concentration based on a minimum of not less than five samples for any 30-day period shall not exceed a geometric mean of 200/100 ml, nor shall more than ten percent of the total number of samples taken during any 30-day period exceed 400/100 ml.

For Folsom Lake (50), the fecal coliform concentration based on a minimum of not less than five samples for any 30-day period, shall not exceed a geometric mean of 100/100 ml, nor shall more than ten percent of the total number of samples taken during any 30-day period exceed 200/100 ml.

Biostimulatory Substances

Water shall not contain biostimulatory substances which promote aquatic growths in concentrations that cause nuisance or adversely affect beneficial uses.

Chemical Constituents

Waters shall not contain chemical constituents in concentrations that adversely affect beneficial uses. The chemical constituent objectives in Table III-1 apply to the water bodies specified. Metal objectives in the table are dissolved concentrations. Selenium,

molybdenum, and boron objectives are total concentrations. Water quality objectives are also contained in the Water Quality Control Plan for Salinity, adopted by the State Water Board in May 1991.

At a minimum, water designated for use as domestic or municipal supply (MUN) shall not contain concentrations of chemical constituents in excess of the maximum contaminant levels (MCLs) specified in the following provisions of Title 22 of the California Code of Regulations, which are incorporated by reference into this plan: Tables 64431-A (Inorganic Chemicals) and 64431-B (Fluoride) of Section 64431, Table 64444-A (Organic Chemicals) of Section 64444, and Tables 64449-A (Secondary Maximum Contaminant Levels-Consumer Acceptance Limits) and 64449-B (Secondary Maximum Contaminant Levels-Ranges) of Section 64449. This incorporation-by-reference is prospective, including future changes to the incorporated provisions as the changes take effect. At a minimum, water designated for use as domestic or municipal supply (MUN) shall not contain lead in excess of 0.015 mg/l. The Regional Water Board acknowledges that specific treatment requirements are imposed by state and federal drinking water regulations on the consumption of surface waters under specific circumstances. To protect all beneficial uses the Regional Water Board may apply limits more stringent than MCLs.

TABLE III-1
TRACE ELEMENT WATER QUALITY OBJECTIVES

CONSTITUENT	MAXIMUM CONCENTRATION ^a (mg/l)	APPLICABLE WATER BODIES
Arsenic	0.01	Sacramento River from Keswick Dam to the I Street Bridge at City of Sacramento (13, 30); American River from Folsom Dam to the Sacramento River (51); Folsom Lake (50); and the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta.
Barium	0.1	As noted above for Arsenic.
Boron	2.0 (15 March through 15 September) 0.8 (monthly mean, 15 March through 15 September) 2.6 (16 September through 14 March) 1.0 (monthly mean, 16 September through 14 March) 1.3 (monthly mean, critical year ^b)	San Joaquin River, mouth of the Merced River to Vernalis
Cadmium	0.00022 ^c	Sacramento River and its tributaries above State Hwy 32 bridge at Hamilton City

TABLE III-1 TRACE
ELEMENT
WATER QUALITY
OBJECTIVES
(Continued)

CONSTITUENT	MAXIMUM CONCENTRATION ^a (mg/l)	APPLICABLE WATER BODIES
Copper	0.0056 ^c	As noted above for Cadmium.
	0.01 ^d	As noted above for Arsenic. ^d
Cyanide	0.01	As noted above for Arsenic.
Iron	0.3	As noted above for Arsenic.
Manganese	0.05	As noted above for Arsenic.
Molybdenum	0.015	San Joaquin River, mouth of the Merced River to Vernalis
	0.010 (monthly mean)	
	0.050	Salt Slough, Mud Slough (north), San Joaquin River from
	0.019 (monthly mean)	Sack Dam to the mouth of Merced River
Selenium	0.012	San Joaquin River, mouth of the Merced River to Vernalis
	0.005 (4-day average)	
	0.020	Mud Slough (north), and the San Joaquin River from Sack
	0.005 (4-day average)	Dam to the mouth of Merced River
	0.020	Salt Slough and constructed and re-constructed water
	0.002 (monthly mean)	supply channels in the Grassland watershed listed in
		Appendix 40.
Silver	0.01	As noted above for Arsenic.
Zinc	0.1 ^d	As noted above for Arsenic. ^d
	0.016 ^c	As noted above for Cadmium.

a Metal objectives in this table are dissolved concentrations. Selenium, molybdenum, and boron objectives are total concentrations.

b See Table IV-3.

c The effects of these concentrations were measured by exposing test organisms to dissolved aqueous solutions of 40 mg/l hardness that had been filtered through a 0.45 micron membrane filter. Where deviations from 40 mg/l of water hardness occur, the objectives, in mg/l, shall be determined using the following formulas:

$$Cu = e^{(0.905)(\ln \text{ hardness}) - 1.612} \times 10^{-3}$$

$$Zn = e^{(0.830)(\ln \text{ hardness}) - 0.289} \times 10^{-3}$$

$$Cd = e^{(1.160)(\ln \text{ hardness}) - 5.777} \times 10^{-3}$$

d Does not apply to Sacramento River above State Hwy. 32 bridge at Hamilton City. See relevant objectives (*) above.

Color

Water shall be free of discoloration that causes nuisance or adversely affects beneficial uses.

Dissolved Oxygen

Within the legal boundaries of the Delta, the dissolved oxygen concentration shall not be reduced below:

7.0 mg/l in the Sacramento River (below the I Street Bridge) and in all Delta waters west of the Antioch Bridge; 6.0 mg/l in the San Joaquin River (between Turner Cut and Stockton, 1 September through 30 November); and 5.0 mg/l in all other Delta waters except for those bodies of water which are constructed for special purposes and from which fish have been

excluded or where the fishery is not important as a beneficial use.

For surface water bodies outside the legal boundaries of the Delta, the monthly median of the mean daily dissolved oxygen (DO) concentration shall not fall below 85 percent of saturation in the main water mass, and the 95 percentile concentration shall not fall below 75 percent of saturation. The dissolved oxygen concentrations shall not be reduced below the following minimum levels at any time:

Waters designated WARM 5.0 mg/l
Waters designated COLD 7.0 mg/l
Waters designated SPWN 7.0 mg/l

The more stringent objectives in Table III-2 apply to specific water bodies in the Sacramento and San Joaquin River Basins:

TABLE III-2
SPECIFIC DISSOLVED OXYGEN WATER QUALITY OBJECTIVES

<u>AMOUNT</u>	<u>TIME</u>	<u>PLACE</u>
9.0 mg/l *	1 June to 31 August	Sacramento River from Keswick Dam to Hamilton City (13)
8.0 mg/l	1 September to 31 May	Feather River from Fish Barrier Dam at Oroville to Honcut Creek (40)
8.0 mg/l	all year	Merced River from Cressy to New Exchequer Dam (78)
8.0 mg/l	15 October to 15 June	Tuolumne River from Waterford to La Grange (86)

* When natural conditions lower dissolved oxygen below this level, the concentrations shall be maintained at or above 95 percent of saturation.

Floating Material

Water shall not contain floating material in amounts that cause nuisance or adversely affect beneficial uses.

Oil and Grease

Waters shall not contain oils, greases, waxes, or other materials in concentrations that cause nuisance, result in a visible film or coating on the surface of the water

or on objects in the water, or otherwise adversely affect beneficial uses.

pH

The pH shall not be depressed below 6.5 nor raised above 8.5. Changes in normal ambient pH levels shall not exceed 0.5 in fresh waters with designated COLD or WARM beneficial uses. In determining

1 September 1998

III-5.00

WATER QUALITY OBJECTIVES

compliance with the water quality objective for pH, appropriate averaging periods may be applied provided that beneficial uses will be fully protected.

For Goose Lake (2), pH shall be less than 9.5 and greater than 7.5 at all times.

Pesticides

- No individual pesticide or combination of pesticides shall be present in concentrations that adversely affect beneficial uses.
- Discharges shall not result in pesticide concentrations in bottom sediments or aquatic life that adversely affect beneficial uses.
- Total identifiable persistent chlorinated hydrocarbon pesticides shall not be present in the water column at concentrations detectable within the accuracy of analytical methods approved by the Environmental Protection Agency or the Executive Officer.
- Pesticide concentrations shall not exceed those allowable by applicable antidegradation policies (see State Water Resources Control Board Resolution No. 68-16 and 40 C.F.R. Section 131.12.).
- Pesticide concentrations shall not exceed the lowest levels technically and economically achievable.
- Waters designated for use as domestic or municipal supply (MUN) shall not contain concentrations of pesticides in excess of the Maximum Contaminant Levels set forth in California Code of Regulations, Title 22, Division 4, Chapter 15.
- Waters designated for use as domestic or municipal supply (MUN) shall not contain concentrations of thiobencarb in excess of 1.0 µg/l.

Where more than one objective may be applicable, the most stringent objective applies.

For the purposes of this objective, the term pesticide shall include: (1) any substance, or mixture of substances which is intended to be used for defoliating plants, regulating plant growth, or for preventing, destroying, repelling, or mitigating any

pest, which may infest or be detrimental to vegetation, man, animals, or households, or be present in any agricultural or nonagricultural environment whatsoever, or (2) any spray adjuvant, or (3) any breakdown products of these materials that threaten beneficial uses. Note that discharges of "inert" ingredients included in pesticide formulations must comply with all applicable water quality objectives.

Radioactivity

Radionuclides shall not be present in concentrations that are harmful to human, plant, animal or aquatic life nor that result in the accumulation of radionuclides in the food web to an extent that presents a hazard to human, plant, animal or aquatic life.

At a minimum, waters designated for use as domestic or municipal supply (MUN) shall not contain concentrations of radionuclides in excess of the maximum contaminant levels (MCLs) specified in Table 4 (MCL Radioactivity) of Section 64443 of Title 22 of the California Code of Regulations, which are incorporated by reference into this plan. This incorporation-by-reference is prospective, including future changes to the incorporated provisions as the changes take effect.

Salinity

Electrical Conductivity and Total Dissolved Solids—Special Cases in the Sacramento and San Joaquin River Basins Other Than the Delta

The objectives for electrical conductivity and total dissolved solids in Table III-3 apply to the water bodies specified. To the extent of any conflict with the general Chemical Constituents water quality objectives, the more stringent shall apply.

Electrical Conductivity, Total Dissolved Solids, and Chloride—Delta Waters

The objectives for salinity (electrical conductivity, total dissolved solids, and chloride) which apply to the Delta are listed in Table III-5 at the chapter's end. See Figure III-2 for an explanation of the hydrologic year type classification system. The objectives in Table III-5 were adopted by the State Water Board in May 1991 in the Water Quality Control Plan for Salinity.

Table III-3

ELECTRICAL CONDUCTIVITY AND TOTAL DISSOLVED SOLIDS

<u>PARAMETER</u>	<u>WATER QUALITY OBJECTIVES</u>	<u>APPLICABLE WATER BODIES</u>
Electrical Conductivity (at 25°C)	Shall not exceed 230 micromhos/cm (50 percentile) or 235 micromhos/cm (90 percentile) at Knights Landing above Colusa Basin Drain; or 240 micromhos/cm (50 percentile) or 340 micromhos/cm (90 percentile) at I Street Bridge, based upon previous 10 years of record.	Sacramento River (13, 30)
	Shall not exceed 150 micromhos/cm (90 percentile) in well-mixed waters of the Feather River.	North Fork of the Feather River (33); Middle Fork of the Feather River from Little Last Chance Creek to Lake Oroville (36); Feather River from the Fish Barrier Dam at Oroville to Sacramento River (40)
	Shall not exceed 150 micromhos/cm from Friant Dam to Gravelly Ford (90 percentile).	San Joaquin River, Friant Dam to Mendota Pool (69)
Total Dissolved Solids	Shall not exceed 125 mg/l (90 percentile)	North Fork of the American River from the source to Folsom Lake (44); Middle Fork of the American River from the source to Folsom Lake (45); South Fork of the American River from the source to Folsom Lake (48, 49); American River from Folsom Dam to Sacramento River (51)
	Shall not exceed 100 mg/l (90 percentile)	Folsom Lake (50)
	Shall not exceed 1,300,000 tons	Goose Lake (2)

Sediment

The suspended sediment load and suspended sediment discharge rate of surface waters shall not be altered in such a manner as to cause nuisance or adversely affect beneficial uses.

Suspended Material

Waters shall not contain suspended material in concentrations that cause nuisance or adversely affect beneficial uses.

Settleable Material

Waters shall not contain substances in concentrations that result in the deposition of material that causes nuisance or adversely affects beneficial uses.

Tastes and Odors

Water shall not contain taste- or odor-producing substances in concentrations that impart undesirable tastes or odors to domestic or municipal water supplies or to fish flesh or other edible products of aquatic origin, or that cause nuisance, or otherwise adversely affect beneficial uses.

Temperature

The natural receiving water temperature of intrastate waters shall not be altered unless it can be demonstrated to the satisfaction of the Regional Water Board that such alteration in temperature does not adversely affect beneficial uses.

Temperature objectives for COLD interstate waters, WARM interstate waters, and Enclosed Bays and Estuaries are as specified in the *Water Quality Control Plan for Control of Temperature in the Coastal and Interstate Waters and Enclosed Bays of California* including any revisions. There are also temperature objectives for the Delta in the State

Water Board's May 1991 *Water Quality Control Plan for Salinity*.

At no time or place shall the temperature of COLD or WARM intrastate waters be increased more than 5°F above natural receiving water temperature. Temperature changes due to controllable factors shall be limited for the water bodies specified as described in Table III-4. To the extent of any conflict with the above, the more stringent objective applies.

In determining compliance with the water quality objectives for temperature, appropriate averaging periods may be applied provided that beneficial uses will be fully protected.

TABLE III-4
SPECIFIC TEMPERATURE OBJECTIVES

<u>DATES</u>	<u>APPLICABLE WATER BODY</u>
From 1 December to 15 March, the maximum temperature shall be 55°F.	Sacramento River from its source to Box Canyon Reservoir (9); Sacramento River from Box Canyon Dam to Shasta Lake (11)
From 16 March to 15 April, the maximum temperature shall be 60°F.	
From 16 April to 15 May, the maximum temperature shall be 65°F.	
From 16 May to 15 October, the maximum temperature shall be 70°F.	
From 16 October to 15 November, the maximum temperature shall be 65°F.	
From 16 November to 30 November, the maximum temperature shall be 60°F.	Lake Siskiyou (10)
The temperature in the epilimnion shall be less than or equal to 75°F or mean daily ambient air temperature, whichever is greater.	
The temperature shall not be elevated above 56°F in the reach from Keswick Dam to Hamilton City nor above 68°F in the reach from Hamilton City to the I Street Bridge during periods when temperature increases will be detrimental to the fishery.	
	Sacramento River from Shasta Dam to I Street Bridge (13, 30)

Toxicity

All waters shall be maintained free of toxic substances in concentrations that produce detrimental physiological responses in human, plant, animal, or aquatic life. This objective applies regardless of whether the toxicity is caused by a single substance or the interactive effect of multiple substances. Compliance with this objective will be determined by analyses of indicator organisms, species diversity, population density, growth anomalies, and biotoxicity

tests of appropriate duration or other methods as specified by the Regional Water Board.

The Regional Water Board will also consider all material and relevant information submitted by the discharger and other interested parties and numerical criteria and guidelines for toxic substances developed by the State Water Board, the California Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment, the California Department of Health Services, the U.S. Food and Drug Administration, the National Academy of Sciences, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, and other appropriate

organizations to evaluate compliance with this objective.

The survival of aquatic life in surface waters subjected to a waste discharge or other controllable water quality factors shall not be less than that for the same water body in areas unaffected by the waste discharge, or, when necessary, for other control water that is consistent with the requirements for "experimental water" as described in *Standard Methods for the Examination of Water and Wastewater*, latest edition. As a minimum, compliance with this objective as stated in the previous sentence shall be evaluated with a 96-hour bioassay.

In addition, effluent limits based upon acute biotoxicity tests of effluents will be prescribed where appropriate; additional numerical receiving water quality objectives for specific toxicants will be established as sufficient data become available; and source control of toxic substances will be encouraged.

Turbidity

Waters shall be free of changes in turbidity that cause nuisance or adversely affect beneficial uses. Increases in turbidity attributable to controllable water quality factors shall not exceed the following limits:

- Where natural turbidity is between 0 and 5 Nephelometric Turbidity Units (NTUs), increases shall not exceed 1 NTU.
- Where natural turbidity is between 5 and 50 NTUs, increases shall not exceed 20 percent.
- Where natural turbidity is between 50 and 100 NTUs, increases shall not exceed 10 NTUs.
- Where natural turbidity is greater than 100 NTUs, increases shall not exceed 10 percent.

In determining compliance with the above limits, appropriate averaging periods may be applied provided that beneficial uses will be fully protected.

Exceptions to the above limits will be considered when a dredging operation can cause an increase in turbidity. In those cases, an allowable zone of dilution within which turbidity in excess of the limits may be tolerated will be defined for the operation and prescribed in a discharge permit.

For Folsom Lake (50) and American River (Folsom Dam to Sacramento River) (51), except for periods of storm runoff, the turbidity shall be less than or equal 10 NTUs. To the extent of any conflict with the general turbidity objective, the more stringent applies.

For Delta waters, the general objectives for turbidity apply subject to the following: except for periods of storm runoff, the turbidity of Delta waters shall not exceed 50 NTUs in the waters of the Central Delta and 150 NTUs in other Delta waters. Exceptions to the Delta specific objectives will be considered when a dredging operation can cause an increase in turbidity. In this case, an allowable zone of dilution within which turbidity in excess of limits can be tolerated will be defined for the operation and prescribed in a discharge permit.

WATER QUALITY OBJECTIVES FOR GROUND WATERS

The following objectives apply to all ground waters of the Sacramento and San Joaquin River Basins, as the objectives are relevant to the protection of designated beneficial uses. These objectives do not require improvement over naturally occurring background concentrations. The ground water objectives contained in this plan are not required by the federal Clean Water Act.

Bacteria

In ground waters used for domestic or municipal supply (MUN) the most probable number of coliform organisms over any seven-day period shall be less than 2.2/100 mL.

Chemical Constituents

Ground waters shall not contain chemical constituents in concentrations that adversely affect beneficial uses.

At a minimum, ground waters designated for use as domestic or municipal supply (MUN) shall not contain concentrations of chemical constituents in excess of the maximum contaminant levels (MCLs) specified in the following provisions of Title 22 of the California Code of Regulations, which are incorporated by reference into this plan: Tables 64431-A (Inorganic Chemicals) and 64431-B

(Fluoride) of Section 64431, Table 64444-A (Organic Chemicals) of Section 64444, and Tables 64449-A (Secondary Maximum Contaminant Levels-Consumer Acceptance Limits) and 64449-B (Secondary Maximum Contaminant Levels-Ranges) of Section 64449. This incorporation-by-reference is prospective, including future changes to the incorporated provisions as the changes take effect. At a minimum, water designated for use as domestic or municipal supply (MUN) shall not contain lead in excess of 0.015 mg/l. To protect all beneficial uses, the Regional Water Board may apply limits more stringent than MCLs.

Radioactivity

At a minimum, ground waters designated for use as domestic or municipal supply (MUN) shall not contain concentrations of radionuclides in excess of the maximum contaminant levels (MCLs) specified in Table 4 (MCL Radioactivity) of Section 64443 of Title 22 of the California Code of Regulations, which are incorporated by reference into this plan. This incorporation-by-reference is prospective, including future changes to the incorporated provisions as the changes take effect.

Tastes and Odors

Ground waters shall not contain taste- or odor-producing substances in concentrations that cause nuisance or adversely affect beneficial uses.

Toxicity

Ground waters shall be maintained free of toxic substances in concentrations that produce detrimental physiological responses in human, plant, animal, or aquatic life associated with designated beneficial use(s). This objective applies regardless of whether the toxicity is caused by a single substance or the interactive effect of multiple substances.

FIGURE III-1

BOUNDARY OF THE SACRAMENTO - SAN JOAQUIN DELTA




FIGURE III-2 *

**Sacramento Valley
Water Year Hydrologic Classification**

Year classification shall be determined by computation of the following equation:


$$\text{INDEX} = 0.4 * X + 0.3 * Y + 0.3 * Z$$

Where: X = Current years April - July
Sacramento Valley unimpaired runoff
Y = Current October - March
Sacramento Valley unimpaired runoff
Z = Previous year's index ¹

The Sacramento Valley unimpaired runoff for the current water year (October 1 of the preceding calendar year through September 30 of the current calendar year) as published in California Department of Water Resources Bulletin 120 is a forecast of the sum of the following locations: Sacramento River above Bend Bridge, near Red Bluff; Feather River, total inflow to Oroville Reservoir; Yuba River at Smartville; American River, total inflow to Folsom Reservoir. Preliminary determinations of year classification shall be made in February, March, and April with final determination in May. These preliminary determinations shall be based on hydrologic conditions to date plus forecasts of future runoff assuming normal precipitation for the remainder of the water year.

Classification	Index Millions of Acre-Feet
Wet.....	Equal to or greater than 9.2
Above Normal.....	Greater than 7.8 and less than 9.2
Below Normal.....	Equal to or less than 7.8 and greater than 6.5
Dry.....	Equal to or less than 6.5 and greater than 5.4
Critical.....	Equal to or less than 5.4

**YEAR TYPE 2
All Years for All Objectives**



¹ A cap of 10.0 MAF is put on the previous years index (X) to account for required flood control reservoir releases during wet years.

² The year type for the preceding water year will remain in effect until the initial forecast of unimpaired runoff for the current water year is available.

* Taken from the State Water Board's "Water Quality Control Plan For Salinity", May 1991, Figure 3-4

TABLE III-5 *: WATER QUALITY OBJECTIVES

A) MUNICIPAL AND INDUSTRIAL USES

LOCATION	SAMPLING SITE NOS. (I-A/RKI)	PARAMETER	DESCRIPTION	INDEX TYPE	YEAR TYPE	DATES	VALUES
Contra Costa Canal at Pumping Plant #1	C-5 CHCCC06	Chloride (Cl-)	Maximum mean daily, in mg/l	Not Applicable	All	Oct-Sep	250
Contra Costa Canal at Pumping Plant #1	C-5 CHCCC06	Chloride (Cl-)	Maximum mean daily 150 mg/l chloride for at least the number of days shown during the Calendar Year. Must be provided in intervals of not less than two weeks duration. (Percentage of Calendar Year shown in parenthesis).	Sacramento River 40-30-30		No. of days each Cal. Year < 150 mg/l Cl-	
- or -					W	240 (66%)	
San Joaquin River at Antioch Water Works Intake	D-12(near) RSAN007	Chloride (Cl-)		Sacramento River 40-30-30	AN	190 (52%)	
					BN	175 (48%)	
					D	165 (45%)	
					C	155 (42%)	
West Canal at mouth of Clifton Court Forebay	C-9 CHWST0	Chloride (Cl-)	Maximum mean daily, in mg/l	Not Applicable	All	Oct-Sep	250
Delta Mendota Canal at Tracy Pumping Plant	DMC-1 CHDMC004	Chloride (Cl-)	Maximum mean daily, in mg/l	Not Applicable	All	Oct-Sep	250
Cache Slough at City of Vallejo Intake [1]	C-19 SLCCH16	Chloride (Cl-)	Maximum mean daily, in mg/l	Not Applicable	All	Oct-Sep	250
-and/or-							
Barker Slough at North Bay Aqueduct Intake	- SLBAR3	Chloride (Cl-)	Maximum mean daily, in mg/l	Not Applicable	All	Oct-Sep	250

* Taken from the State Water Board's "Water Quality Control Plan For Salinity", May 1991

TABLE III-5* (cont.): WATER QUALITY OBJECTIVES

B) AGRICULTURAL USES BY AREA

LOCATION	SAMPLING SITE NOS. (I-A/RKI)	PARAMETER	DESCRIPTION	INDEX TYPE	YEAR TYPE	DATES	VALUES
1) WESTERN DELTA							
Sacramento River at Emmaton	D-22 RSAC092	Electrical Con- ductivity (EC)	Maximum 14-day running average of mean daily, in mmhos/cm (mmhos)	Sacramento River 40-30-30		0.45 EC April 1 to Date Shown	EC from Date Shown to Aug. 15 [2]
					W	Aug. 15	--
					AN	July 1	0.63
					BN	June 20	1.14
					D	June 15	1.67
					C	--	2.78
San Joaquin River at Jersey Point	D-15 RSAN018	Electrical Con- ductivity (EC)	Maximum 14-day running average of mean daily, in mmhos	Sacramento River 40-30-30		0.45 EC April 1 to Date Shown	EC from Date Shown to Aug. 15 [2]
					W	Aug. 15	--
					AN	Aug. 15	--
					BN	June 20	0.74
					D	June 15	1.35
					C	--	2.20
2) INTERIOR DELTA							
South Fork Mokelumne River at Terminous	C-13 RSMKL08	Electrical Con- ductivity (EC)	Maximum 14-day running average of mean daily, in mmhos	Sacramento River 40-30-30		0.45 EC April 1 to Date Shown	EC from Date Shown to Aug. 15 [2]
					W	Aug. 15	--
					AN	Aug. 15	--
					BN	Aug. 15	--
					D	Aug. 15	--
					C	--	0.54
San Joaquin River at San Andreas Landing	C-4 RSAN032	Electrical Con- ductivity (EC)	Maximum 14-day running average of mean daily, in mmhos	Sacramento River 40-30-30		0.45 EC April 1 to Date Shown	EC from Date Shown to Aug. 15 [2]
					W	Aug. 15	--
					AN	Aug. 15	--
					BN	Aug. 15	--
					D	Jun. 25	0.58
					C	--	0.87

* Taken from the State Water Board's "Water Quality Control Plan For Salinity", May 1991

TABLE III-5* (cont.) : WATER QUALITY OBJECTIVES

B) AGRICULTURAL USES BY AREA

LOCATION	SAMPLING SITE NOS. (I-A/RKI)	PARAMETER	DESCRIPTION	INDEX TYPE	YEAR TYPE	DATES	VALUES
(To be implemented by 1996) [3]			3) SOUTH DELTA				
San Joaquin River at Airport Way Bridge, Vernalis	C-10 RSAN112	Electrical Conductivity (EC)	Maximum 30-day running average of mean daily, in mmhos	Not Applicable	All	Apr 1-Aug 31 Sep 1-Mar 31	0.7 1.0
Old River near Middle River	C-8 ROLD69					or	
Old River at Tracy Road Bridge	P-12 ROLD59						
San Joaquin River at Brandt Bridge [site]	C-6 RSAN073						
			If a three-party contract has been implemented among DWR, USBR and the SDWA, that contract will be reviewed prior to implementation of the above and , after also considering the needs of other beneficial uses, revisions will be made to the objectives and compliance/monitoring locations noted above, as appropriate.				
			4) EXPORT				
West Canal at mouth of Clifton Court Forebay -and- Delta Mendota Canal at Tracy Pumping Plant	C-9 CHWST0 DMC-1 CHDMC004	Electrical Conductivity (EC)	Maximum monthly average of mean daily EC, in mmhos	Not Applicable	All	Oct-Sept	1.0

* Taken from the State Water Board's "Water Quality Control Plan For Salinity", May 1991

TABLE III-5* (cont.): WATER QUALITY OBJECTIVES

C) FISH AND WILDLIFE BY HABITAT/SPECIES

LOCATION	SAMPLING SITE NOS. (I-A/R/KI)	PARAMETER	DESCRIPTION	INDEX TYPE	YEAR TYPE	DATES	VALUES
CHINOOK SALMON							
DISSOLVED OXYGEN							
San Joaquin River between Turner Cut & Stockton	RSAN050- RSAN061	Dissolved Oxygen (DO)	Minimum dissolved oxygen, in mg/l	Not Applicable	All	Sep 1-Nov 30	6.0
TEMPERATURE							
Sacramento River at Freeport and	RSAC155	Temperature	Narrative Objective	Not Applicable	All	"The daily average water temperature shall not be elevated by controllable factors above 68 deg. F from the I Street Bridge to Freeport on the Sacramento River, and at Vernalis on the San Joaquin River between April 1 through June 30 and September 1 through November 30 in all water year types." [4]	
San Joaquin River at Airport Way Bridge, Vernalis	C-10 RSAN112	Temperature	Narrative Objective	Not Applicable	All		
Sacramento River at Freeport	RSAC155	Temperature	Narrative Objective	Not Applicable	All		

* Taken from the State Water Board's "Water Quality Control Plan For Salinity", May 1991

TABLE III-5* (cont.): WATER QUALITY OBJECTIVES

C) FISH AND WILDLIFE BY HABITAT/SPECIES

LOCATION	SAMPLING SITE NOS. (I-A/RKI)	PARAMETER	DESCRIPTION	INDEX TYPE	YEAR TYPE	DATES	VALUES
STRIPED BASS - SALINITY:1 ANTIOCH - SPAWNING							
Sacramento River at Chipps Island	D-10 RSAC075	Delta outflow Index (DOI)	Average for the period not less than the value shown, in cfs.	Not Applicable	All	Apr 1-Apr 14	6,700
San Joaquin River at Antioch Water Works Intake	D-12 (near) RSAN007	Electrical Con- ductivity (EC)	14-day running average of mean daily for the period not more than value shown, in mmhos	Not Applicable	All	Apr 15-May 31 (or until spawning has ended)	1.5
STRIPED BASS-SALINITY:2. ANTIOCH-SPAWNING-RELAXATION PROVISION							
San Joaquin River at Antioch Water Works Intake	D-12 (near) RSAN007	Electrical Con- ductivity (EC)	14-day running average of mean daily EC in mmhos, not more than value shown corresponding to deficiencies in firm supplies declared by a set of water projects representative of the Sacramento River and San Joaquin River watersheds, for the period shown, or until spawning has ended. The specific representative projects and amounts of deficiencies will be defined in subsequent phases of the proceedings.	Total Annual Imposed Deficiency (MAF)		Apr 1-May 31 EC in mmhos Dry Critical	
This relaxation provision replaces the above Antioch & Chipps Island standard whenever the projects impose deficiencies in firm supplies.				0.0		1.5	1.5
				0.5		1.8	1.9
				1.0		1.8	2.5
				1.5		1.8	3.4
				2.0 or more		1.8	3.7
STRIPED BASS-SALINITY:3. PRISONERS POINT-SPAWNING							
San Joaquin River at: Prisoners Point	D-29 RSAN038	Electrical Con- ductivity (EC)	14-day running average of mean daily for the period not more than value shown, in mmhos	Sacramento River 40-30-30	All	Apr 1-May 31 (or until spawning has ended)	0.44

Linear interpolation is to be
used to determine values between
those shown.

* Taken from the State Water Board's "Water Quality Control Plan For Salinity", May 1991

TABLE III-5* (cont.): WATER QUALITY OBJECTIVES

C) FISH AND WILDLIFE BY HABITAT/SPECIES

LOCATION	SAMPLING SITE NOS. (I-A/RKI)	PARAMETER	DESCRIPTION	INDEX TYPE	YEAR TYPE	DATES	VALUES
STRIPED BASS-SALINITY: 4. PRISONERS POINT-SPAWNING-RELAXATION PROVISION							
<i>When the relaxation provision for Antioch spawning protection is in effect:</i>							
San Joaquin River at: Prisoners Point	D-29 RSAN038	Electrical Con- ductivity (EC)	14-day running average of mean daily for the period not more than value shown, in mmhos	Sacramento River 40-30-30	D&C	Apr 1-May 31 (or until spawning has ended)	0.55

FOOTNOTES:

- [1] The Cache Slough objective to be effective only when water is being diverted from this location.
- [2] When no date is shown, EC limit continues from April 1.
- [3] South Delta Agriculture objectives will be implemented in stages: two interim stages and one final stage. The first interim stage will be implemented with the adoption of the WQCP, the second interim stage by 1994, and the final stage by 1996. Interim Stage 1 -- 500 mg/l mean monthly TDS all year at Vernalis. Interim Stage 2 -- (to be implemented no later than 1994) 0.7 mmhos/cm EC April 1 to August 31, 1.0 mmhos/cm EC September 1 to March 31, 30-day running average, at Vernalis and Brandt Bridge; with water quality monitored at three current interior stations -- Mossdale, Old River, near Middle River and Tracy Road Bridge, and an additional interior monitoring station on Middle River at Howard Road Bridge. Final Stage -- (to be implemented no later than 1996) 0.7 mmhos/cm EC April 1 to August 31, 1.0 mmhos/cm EC September 1 to March 31, 30-day running average, at Vernalis and Brandt Bridge on the San Joaquin River; with two interior stations at Old River Near Middle River and Old River at Tracy Road Bridge. Monitoring stations will be at Mossdale at head of Old River and Middle River at Howard Road Bridge.
- OR
- If a three-party contract has been implemented among DWR, USBR and the SDWA, that contract will be reviewed prior to implementation of the above and, after also considering the needs of other beneficial uses, revisions will be made to the objectives and compliance/monitoring locations noted above, as appropriate.
- [4] Controllable water quality factors are those actions, conditions, or circumstances resulting from human activities that may influence the quality of the waters of the State, that are subject to the authority of the State Board, or the Regional Board, and that may be reasonably controlled. Based on the record in these proceedings, controlling temperature in the Delta utilizing reservoir releases does not appear to be reasonable, due to the distance of the Delta downstream of reservoirs and uncontrollable factors such as ambient air temperature, water temperatures in the reservoir releases, etc. For these reasons, the State Board considers reservoir releases to control water temperatures in the Delta a waste of water; therefore, the State Board will require a test of reasonableness before consideration of reservoir releases for such a purpose.

IV. IMPLEMENTATION

The Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act states that basin plans consist of beneficial uses, water quality objectives and a program of implementation for achieving their water quality objectives [Water Code Section 13050(j)]. The implementation program shall include, but not be limited to:

1. A description of the nature of actions which are necessary to achieve the objectives, including recommendations for appropriate action by any entity, public or private;
2. A time schedule for the actions to be taken; and,
3. A description of surveillance to be undertaken to determine compliance with the objectives (Water Code Section 13242).

In addition, State law requires that basin plans indicate estimates of the total cost and identify potential sources of funding of any agricultural water quality control program prior to its implementation. (Water Code Section 13141). This chapter of the Basin Plan responds to all but the surveillance requirement. That is described in Chapter V.

This chapter is organized as follows: The first section contains a general description of water quality concerns. These are organized by discharger type (e.g., agriculture, silviculture, mines, etc.). The second section lists programs, plans and policies which should result in the achievement of most of the water quality objectives in this plan. This section includes descriptions of State Water Board policies, statewide plans, statewide programs dealing with specific waste discharge problems (e.g., underground tanks, storm water, solid waste disposal sites, etc.), memoranda of understanding, management agency agreements, memoranda of agreement, Regional Water Board policies, a listing of Regional Water Board prohibition areas, and Regional Water Board guidelines addressing specific water quality problems. The third section contains recommendations for appropriate action by entities other than the Regional Water Board. The fourth section describes how; within the framework of the programs, plans and policies discussed in the second section; the Regional Water Board integrates water quality control activities into a continuing planning process. The fifth section identifies the current actions and the time schedule for future actions of the Regional Water Board to achieve compliance with

water quality objectives where the programs, plans and policies in the second section are not adequate. The last section lists the estimated costs and funding sources for agricultural water quality control programs that are implemented by the Regional Water Board.

WATER QUALITY CONCERNS

Water quality concerns are existing or potential water quality problems, i.e., impairments of beneficial uses or degradations of water quality. At any given time, water quality problems generally reflect the intensity of activities of key discharge sources and the volume, quality, and uses of the receiving waters affected by the discharges.

Historic and ongoing point and nonpoint source discharges impact surface waters. Significant portions of major rivers and the Delta are impaired, to some degree, by discharges from agriculture, mines, urban areas and industries. Upstream, small streams and tributaries to the Rivers are impaired or threatened because of discharges from mines, silviculture activities, and urban development activities. Control approaches may differ depending on the source of the problem.

A variety of historic and ongoing point and non-point industrial, urban, and agricultural activities degrade the quality of ground water. Discharges to ground water associated with these activities include industrial and agricultural chemical use and spills; underground and above ground tank and sump leaks; landfill leachate and gas releases; septic tank failures; improper animal waste management; and chemical seepage via shallow drainage wells and abandoned wells. The resulting impacts on ground water quality from these discharges are often long-term and costly to treat or remediate. Consequently, as discharges are identified, containment and cleanup of source areas and plumes must be undertaken as quickly as possible. Furthermore, activities that may potentially impact ground water must be managed to ensure that ground water quality is protected.

Improper management of waste materials and spillage of industrial fluids have degraded or polluted ground water resources beneath military bases, rail yards, wood treating facilities, aerospace manufacturing and testing operations, municipal gas

plants, fuel tank farms, pesticide formulators, dry cleaners, and other industrial facilities. Many of the sites contain high concentrations of contaminants in soils, which continue to be sources of ground water degradation and pollution, until remediated.

Our knowledge of amounts and types of problems associated with discharge activities change over time. Early federal and state control efforts tended to focus on the most understood or visible problems such as the discharge of raw sewage to rivers and streams. As these problems were controlled and as pollutant detection and measurement methods improved, regulatory emphasis shifted. For example, control of toxic discharges is now a major concern. Toxicity can be associated with many discharge activities. Its effects may be first expressed as acute or chronic reductions in the number of organisms in receiving waters. Minute amounts of toxic materials may also impair beneficial uses from accumulation in tissues or sediments.

Discharges are sometimes sorted into *point source* and *nonpoint source* categories. A point source discharge usually refers to waste emanating from a single, identifiable place. A nonpoint source discharge usually refers to waste emanating from diffused locations. The Regional Water Board may control either type of discharge, but the control approaches may differ.

Salt management is becoming increasingly important in the San Joaquin Valley for urban and agricultural interests. If current practices for discharging waters containing elevated levels of salt continue unabated, the San Joaquin Valley can have a large portion of its ground water severely degraded within a few decades. Therefore, the Regional Water Board will pursue strategies that will achieve the availability of a valley-wide drain for the discharge of agricultural wastewaters and drain waters degraded by elevated levels of salt and in which nutrient and toxic material concentrations meet applicable standards. Following is a brief description of the water quality impacts associated with basin discharge activities along with some general control considerations.

Agriculture

Agricultural activities affect water quality in a number of ways. There are unique problems associated with irrigated agriculture, agricultural support activities, and animal confinement operations because of the volume of water used and the diffused nature of many of the discharges.

Irrigated Agriculture

Irrigated agriculture accounts for most water use in the two sub-basins. Both the San Joaquin and the Sacramento Rivers carry substantial amounts of agricultural return water or drainage. Agricultural drainage contributes salts, nutrients, pesticides, trace elements, sediments, and other by-products that affect the water quality of the rivers and the Delta.

There is a Memorandum of Understanding between the State Water Board and Department of Pesticide Regulation describing the role of each agency with regard to pesticide regulation.

Salt management is critical to agriculture in the Central Valley. Evaporation and crop transpiration remove water from soils which can result in an accumulation of salts in the root zone of the soils at levels that retard or inhibit plant growth. Additional amounts of water often are applied to leach the salts below the root zones. The leached salts can reach ground or surface water. The movement of the salts to surface waters may be a natural occurrence of subsurface flows or it can result from the surface water discharge of subsurface collection systems (often called tile drains) which are routinely employed in areas of the Central Valley where farm lands have poor drainage capabilities. The tile drainage practice consists of installing collection systems below the root zone of the crops to drain soils that would otherwise stay saturated because of subsurface conditions that restrict drainage. Tile drain installation may result in TDS concentrations in drainage water many times greater than in the irrigation water that was applied to the crops. Tile drain water can also contain pesticides, trace elements, and nutrients.

Pesticides and nutrients are also major ingredients of surface agricultural drainage. They have found their way to ground and surface waters in many areas of the basins. Fish and aquatic wildlife deaths attributable to pesticide contamination of surface water occur periodically.

Nitrate and DBCP (1,2-Dibromo-3-chloropropane) levels exceeding the State drinking water standards occur extensively in ground water in the basins and public and domestic supply wells have been closed because of DBCP, EDB, nitrates, and other contaminants in several locations.

Discharge of sediment is another problem encountered with agriculture. Sedimentation impairs fisheries and, by virtue of the characteristics of many

organic and inorganic compounds to bind to soil particles, it serves to distribute and circulate toxic substances through the riparian, estuarine, and marine systems. Sedimentation also increases the costs of pumping and treating water for municipal and industrial use. An additional significant impact of sediment in runoff is the sediment's direct smothering effect on bottom dwelling communities.

The Regional Water Board approaches problems related to irrigated agriculture as it does other categories of problems. Staff are assigned to identify and evaluate beneficial use impairments associated with agricultural discharges. Control actions are developed and implemented as appropriate per the schedules identified through the continuous planning process (see section titled, "ACTIONS AND SCHEDULE TO ACHIEVE WATER QUALITY OBJECTIVES").

Agricultural Support Activities

These are the activities associated with the application of pesticides, disposal of pesticide rinse waters, and formulation of pesticides and fertilizers. Major water quality problems connected with all of these operations stem from the discharge of waters used to clean equipment or work areas. The Region has confirmed cases of ground water contamination as a result of improper containment and disposal of rinse water.

Many of the application facilities fall under Regional Water Board regulatory programs. When appropriate, best management practices are recommended. Regional Water Board staff also inspects high risk sites to evaluate compliance. Enforcement strategies are implemented as warranted.

Animal Confinement Operations

Runoff from animal confinement facilities (e.g., stockyards, dairies, poultry ranches) can impair both surface and ground water beneficial uses. The animal wastes may produce significant amounts of coliform, ammonia, nitrate, and TDS contamination. The greatest potential for water quality problems has historically stemmed from the overloading of the facilities' waste containment and treatment ponds during the rainy season and inappropriate application of wastewater and manure. Most of these facilities are not operating under waste discharge requirements (WDRs). However, waste management at all confined animal facilities must comply with specific regulations and large facilities must obtain an NPDES storm water permit.

Silviculture

Forest management activities, principally timber harvesting and application of herbicides, have the potential to impact beneficial uses. Timber harvest activities annually take place on tens of thousands of acres of private and federal land in the Central Valley Region and they may affect water quality throughout the area being harvested. Erosion can result from road construction, logging, and post-logging operations. Logging debris may be deposited in streams. Landslides and other mass soil movements can also occur as a result of timber operations.

Herbicides may be used in silviculture to reduce commercial timber competition from weeds, grasses, and other plants or to prepare a site for planting of commercial species by eliminating existing vegetation. Use of herbicides has caused concern among regulatory agencies and the public because of the possibility of transport from target sites to streams by wind and water runoff.

The State and Regional Water Boards entered into agreements with both the U.S. Forest Service and the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection which require these agencies to control nonpoint source discharges by implementing control actions certified by the State Water Board as best management practices (*BMPs*). The Regional Water Board enforces compliance with *BMP* implementation and may impose control actions above and beyond what is specified in the agreements if the practices are not applied correctly or do not protect water quality. Point source discharges on federal and state and private forest lands are regulated through waste discharge limits.

Municipalities and Industries

Municipal and industrial point source discharges to surface waters are generally controlled through National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (*NPDES*) permits. Although the *NPDES* program was established by the Clean Water Act, the permits are prepared and enforced by the Regional Water Boards per California's authority for the Act. The number of cases of ground water pollution attributable to industrial or municipal sources has increased steadily. For example, the Region's inventory of underground storage tanks indicates the number of leaking tanks is high. Ground water contamination from other industrial sources generally occurs from practices of disposing of fluids or other materials used in production processes. Waste

compounds have been discharged directly to unlined sumps, pits, or depressions and spread on soils. In some cases, these disposal practices went on many years before they were discovered or discontinued. Leaking municipal or industrial sewer lines also contribute to ground water pollution.

The promulgation of EPA sludge regulations under section 503 of the Clean Water Act and the adoption of water quality objectives for toxic pollutants pursuant to section 303(c)(2)(B) will require that NPDES permits, upon renewal, be updated to reflect these new regulations. Once effluent limitations sufficient to comply with sludge requirements and water quality objectives for toxic pollutants have been placed into NPDES permits, POTWs subject to pretreatment program requirements will be required to update their local limits consistent with EPA pretreatment program regulations and guidance.

Storm Water

Runoff from residential and industrial areas also contributes to water quality degradation. Urban storm water runoff contains pesticides, oil, grease, heavy metals, polynuclear aromatic hydrocarbons, other organics, and nutrients. Because these pollutants accumulate during the dry summer months, the first major autumn storm can flush a highly concentrated load to receiving waters and catch basins. Combined storm and sanitary systems may result in some runoff to sewage treatment plants. In other cases, storm water collection wells can produce direct discharges to ground water. Impacts of storm water contaminants on surface and ground waters are an important concern.

The "Control Action Considerations of the State Water Board" section in Chapter IV provides more detail on how the Regional Water Board regulates storm water.

Mineral Exploration and Extraction

Mineral exploration and extraction discharges are associated with several ore, geothermal, and petroleum/natural gas activities. The discharge of greatest concern in the Sacramento and San Joaquin River Basins is the result of ore exploration and extraction.

Drainage and runoff from mines and various operations associated with mining can result in serious impacts to ground and surface water beneficial uses, if not properly managed. Along

much of the east side of the Coast Range, runoff, drainage, and erosion from old mercury mines is a problem that has resulted in high levels of mercury in aquatic environments and fish tissue. There are also major metal and acid discharges associated with abandoned copper mines in the Sierra/ Cascades drainages. Sedimentation can be a problem in the construction and operation of many mines.

Within the past decade there has been a significant increase in the amount of gold extraction and processing in the Sierra foothills and in the Coast Ranges. Most of these operations have been made possible by advances in technology, permitting the economical extraction of minute quantities of gold from large volumes of ore with the use of cyanide and other reagents by heap and vat leach methods, and by the current high price of gold on world markets. Advances in ore and waste rock handling techniques have made open pit mining more profitable and common. These mining operations involve the handling and management of large quantities of ore, potentially-toxic chemical reagents, tailings, waste rock, and spent leaching solutions in piles, tailings ponds, and impoundments. If not carefully managed, these operations have the potential to leach toxic reagents, heavy metals, salts, and acidic drainage waters into surface and ground water resources. Mining waste management facilities and associated mining operations are regulated through the issuance of waste discharge requirements under the State and Regional Water Boards' *Discharges of Waste to Land* regulatory program.

Efforts to control drainage have gradually expanded over the years. Staff assessments of mine water quality problems done in 1979 and 1992 helped direct the Regional Water Board's approach to the problems. When other options were exhausted, the Regional Water Board has used public funds to abate pollution from these mines.

Geothermal operations in the basins are centered in the Geysers Area of Lake County. Potential impacts to water quality are caused by soil erosion from road construction and site preparation, high pressure steam blowouts, and accidental spills of materials from drilling operations, power plants, steam condensate lines, and waste transport accidents. Bentonite clay, boron, ammonia, sodium hydroxide, sulfur compounds, heavy metals, and petroleum products are found in various concentrations in mud sumps, steam condensate lines, and sulfide abatement sludge. Operational failures can release these substances into waterways.

Hazardous and Non-Hazardous Waste Disposal

Discharges of solid, semi-solid, and liquid wastes to landfills, waste piles, surface impoundments, pits, trenches, tailings ponds, natural depressions and land treatment facilities (collectively called "waste management units") have the potential to create sources of pollution affecting the quality of waters of the State. Unlike surface waters which often have the capacity to assimilate discharged waste constituents, ground waters have little or no assimilative capacity, due to their slow migration rate, lack of aeration, lower biological activity, and laminar flow patterns. If the concentrations of pollutants in the land-discharged waste are sufficiently high to prevent the waste from being classified as "inert waste" under 23 CCR, Section 2524, discharges of such wastes to waste management units require long term containment or active treatment following the discharge in order to prevent waste or waste constituents from migrating to and impairing the beneficial uses of waters of the State. Pollutants from such discharges may continue to affect water quality long after the discharge of new waste to the unit has ceased, either because of continued leachate or gas discharges from the unit, or because pollutants have accumulated in underlying soils from which they are gradually released to ground water.

Landfills for disposal of municipal or industrial solid waste (solid waste disposal sites) are the major categories of waste management units in the region, but there are also surface impoundments used for storage or evaporative treatment of liquid wastes, waste piles for the storage of solid wastes, and land treatment units for the biological treatment of semi-solid sludges from wastewater treatment facilities and liquid wastes from cannery and other industrial operations. Sumps, trenches, and soil depressions have been used in the past for liquid waste disposal. Mining waste management units (tailings ponds, surface impoundments, and waste piles) also represent a significant portion of the waste management units in the Region. The Regional Water Board issues waste discharge requirements to ensure that these discharges are properly contained to protect the Region's water resources from degradation, and to ensure that dischargers undertake effective monitoring to verify continued compliance with requirements.

These discharges, and the waste management units at which the wastes are discharged, are subject to concurrent regulation by other State and local

agencies responsible for land use planning, solid waste management, and hazardous waste management. "Local Enforcement Agencies" (mainly cities and counties) implement the State's solid waste management laws and local ordinances governing the siting, design, and operation of solid waste disposal facilities (usually landfills) with the concurrence of the California Integrated Waste Management Board (CIWMB). The CIWMB also has direct responsibility for review and approval of plans for closure and post-closure maintenance of solid waste landfills. The Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) issues permits for all hazardous waste treatment, storage, and disposal facilities (which include hazardous waste incinerators, tanks, and warehouses where hazardous wastes are stored in drums as well as landfills, waste piles, surface impoundments, and land treatment units). The State Water Board, Regional Water Boards, CIWMB, and DTSC have entered into a Memoranda of Understanding to coordinate their respective roles in the concurrent regulation of these discharges. In addition, the Toxic Pits Cleanup Act of 1984 precludes the storage or disposal of liquid hazardous wastes or hazardous wastes containing free liquids. The Regional Water Board is responsible for enforcing this Act under the authority of the Health and Safety Code, Section 25208 et seq. (See page IV-13 for further description).

The statutes and regulations governing the discharges of both hazardous and non-hazardous wastes have been revised and strengthened in the last few years. The discharge of municipal solid wastes to land are closely regulated and monitored; however, some water quality problems have been detected and are being addressed. Recent monitoring efforts under the State and Regional Water Boards' Chapter 15 and SWAT programs have revealed that discharges of municipal solid wastes to unlined and single clay lined landfills have resulted in ground water degradation and pollution by volatile organic constituents (VOCs) and other waste constituents. VOCs are components of many household hazardous wastes and certain industrial wastes that are present within municipal solid waste streams. VOCs can easily migrate from landfills either in leachate or by vapor-phase transport. Clay liners and natural clay formations between discharged wastes and ground waters are largely ineffective in preventing water quality impacts from municipal solid waste constituents. In a recently adopted policy for water quality control, the State Water Board found that "[r]esearch on liner systems for landfills indicates that (a) single clay liners will only delay, rather than preclude, the onset of leachate leakage, and (b) the

use of composite liners represents the most effective approach for reliably containing leachate and landfill gas" (State Water Board Resolution No. 93-62, *Policy for Regulation of Discharges of Municipal Solid Waste*).

As a result of similar information on a national scale, the U. S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) has adopted new regulations under Subtitle D of the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) which require the containment of municipal solid wastes by composite liners and leachate collection systems. Composite liners consist of a flexible synthetic membrane component placed above and in intimate contact with a compacted low-permeability soil component. This liner system enhances the effectiveness of the leachate collection and removal system and provides a barrier to vapor-phase transport of VOCs from the unit. Regional Water Boards and the CIWMB are implementing these new regulations in California under a policy for water quality control from the State Water Board (Resolution No. 93-62, discussed above) and new regulations from CIWMB. The State Water Board is in the process of developing revised regulations under 23 CCR, Division 3, Chapter 15, *Discharges of Waste to Land*, to fully implement water quality-related portions of the RCRA Subtitle D federal regulations. While a single composite liner of the type that can be approved under Subtitle D regulations is a significant improvement over past municipal solid waste containment systems, it should be noted, however, that single composite liners will not necessarily provide complete protection for ground water resources.

Contaminated Sites Threatening Ground Water Quality

The Regional Water Board has identified over 7000 sites with confirmed releases of constituents of concern which have adversely impacted or threaten to impact the quality of ground water resources. Sources of pollution at these sites include: leaking underground storage tanks and sumps; leaking above ground tanks; leaking pipelines; leaking waste management units, such as landfills, disposal pits, trenches and ponds; surface spills from chemical handling, transfer or storage; poor housekeeping; and illegal disposal. A policy for investigation and cleanup of such sites is contained in the section of this chapter titled "Policy for Investigation and Cleanup of Contaminated Sites."

Other Discharge Activities

Some remaining discharges of major concern include sedimentation from land development activities in the foothills and mountains, leachate from septic tank/individual wastewater disposal systems, and dredging and dredging spoils runoff.

Many of the foothill/mountain counties in the sub-basins face high growth rates. Sedimentation from the land disturbances associated with residential and commercial development is an increasing problem that, when added to the sedimentation resulting from farming and silvicultural operation, may require establishment of a region-wide erosion control program. The Regional Water Board's current practice is to emphasize local government control of erosion caused by residential development. Erosion control guidelines are included in the erosion/sedimentation action plan which is in the Appendix.

Improperly located, designed, constructed and/or maintained on-site wastewater treatment and disposal systems can result in ground and surface water degradation and public health hazards. The Regional Water Board's approach is that the control of individual wastewater treatment and disposal systems is best accomplished by local environmental health departments enforcing county ordinances designed to provide protection to ground and surface waters. To help the counties with enforcement, the Regional Water Board adopted guidelines which contain criteria for proper installation of conventional systems (see Guidelines section of this chapter and Appendix). Although the Regional Water Board has also prohibited septic tank usage in certain areas, it has formal and informal agreements with counties to evaluate field performance of alternative and special design systems.

The energy crisis of the 1970s resulted in a surge of small hydroelectric facility development in the mountains and foothills. Impairments to beneficial uses may occur because of erosion from construction and changes in water temperature. The Regional Water Board has published guidelines for small hydro-electric facilities (see Guidelines section of this chapter and Appendix) to help address some of the problems associated with small hydroelectric plants.

Dredging is a problem because the process can result in turbidity and the reintroduction and resuspension of harmful metal or organic materials. This latter effect occurs directly as a result of the displacement

of sediment at the dredging site and indirectly as a result of erosion of dredge spoil to surface waters at the deposition site. Another major concern is water quality problems associated with the dredge spoils disposal site. There is much dredging of the Sacramento and San Joaquin Rivers and the Delta because of the need to maintain the ship channels to the Ports of Sacramento and Stockton. The Regional Water Board regulates dredging operations on a case-by-case basis. Operational criteria may result from permits or the water quality certification requirements stemming from Section 401(a) of the Clean Water Act.

In addition to the problems described above, the Regional Water Board responds to spontaneous discharges such as spills, leaks and overflows. These can have cumulatively or individually significant effects on beneficial uses of ground and surface waters.

Water Bodies with Special Water Quality Problems

Water quality management may require the identification and ranking of water bodies with regard to certain quality parameters. Water Quality Limited Segments (*WQLSs*) are one example of expressing water quality problems by water bodies. *WQLSs* are those sections of lakes, streams, rivers or other fresh water bodies where water quality does not meet (or is not expected to meet) water quality standards even after the application of appropriate effluent limitations for point sources (40 CFR 130, et seq.).

Additional treatment beyond minimum federal requirements will be imposed on dischargers to *WQLSs*. Dischargers will be assigned or allocated a maximum allowable load of critical pollutants so that water quality objectives can be met in the segment.

The Regional Water Board's current list of *WQLSs* is Appendix Item 38.

THE NATURE OF CONTROL ACTIONS IMPLEMENTED BY THE REGIONAL WATER BOARD

The nature of actions to achieve water quality objectives consists of Regional Water Board efforts:

1. to identify potential water quality problems;

2. to confirm and characterize water quality problems through assessments for source, frequency, duration, extent, fate, and severity;
3. to remedy water quality problems through imposing or enforcing appropriate measures; and
4. to monitor problem areas to assess effectiveness of the remedial measures.

Generally, the actions associated with the first step consist of surveys or reviews of survey information and other data sources to isolate possible impairments of beneficial uses or water quality.

The characterization step usually involves studies that attempt to answer questions about a water quality problem's source, extent, duration, frequency, and severity. Information on these parameters is essential to confirm a problem and prepare for remedy. The Regional Water Board may gain this information through its own work or through data submittals requested of actual or potential dischargers under Section 13267 of the California Water Code.

Problem remedy calls for the Regional Water Board to prevent or clean up problems. A common means of prevention is through the issuance of National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permits, waste discharge requirements (WDRs), discharge prohibitions, and other discharge restrictions. Cleanup is implemented through enforcement measures such as Cease and Desist (*C&D*) and Cleanup and Abatement (*C&A*) orders. The NPDES is a requirement of the Federal Clean Water Act (Section 402) and California has implementing responsibility. The national permit system only applies to certain surface water discharges. WDRs, which encompass permits, are called for by State law, Water Code Section 13260, et seq. The WDRs system is not as restricted as the Federal NPDES. As practical, WDRs may be used to control any type of discharge to ground or surface waters. *C&D* and *C&A* orders are two of the enforcement tools available to the Regional Water Board to correct actual or potential violations of WDRs, NPDES permits, prohibitions, and other water quality control obligations.

The details of the monitoring step are explained in Chapter V. In general, the Regional Water Board has wide latitude to require actual and potential dischargers to submit monitoring and surveillance information, in addition to using State Water Board data or collecting its own.

Whatever actions the Regional Water Board implements must be consistent with the Basin Plan's beneficial uses and water quality objectives, as well as certain State and Regional Water Boards' policies, plans, agreements, prohibitions, guidance, and other restrictions or requirements. These considerations are described below and included in the Appendix when noted.

Control Action Considerations of the State Water Board

Policies and Plans

There are ten State Water Board water quality control policies and three State Water Board water quality control plans to which Regional Water Board actions must conform. Sections 13146 and 13247 of the California Water Code generally require that, in carrying out activities which affect water quality, all state agencies, departments, boards and offices must comply with all policies for water quality control and with applicable water quality control plans approved or adopted by the State Water Board. Two of the plans, the Ocean Plan and the Tahoe Plan, do not affect the Sacramento and San Joaquin River Basins. The policies and plans that are applicable are described below.

1. *The State Policy for Water Quality Control*

This policy declares the State Water Board's intent to protect water quality through the implementation of water resources management programs and serves as the general basis for subsequent water quality control policies. The policy was adopted by the State Water Board in 1972. See Appendix Item 1.

2. *State Water Board Resolution No. 68-16, Statement of Policy with Respect to Maintaining High Quality of Water in California*

The State Water Board adopted this policy on 28 October 1968. The policy generally restricts the Regional Water Board and dischargers from reducing the water quality of surface or ground waters even though such a reduction in water quality might still allow the protection of the beneficial uses associated with the water prior to the quality reduction. The goal of the policy is to maintain high quality waters.

Changes in water quality are allowed only if the change is consistent with maximum benefit to

the people of the State; does not unreasonably affect present and anticipated beneficial uses; and, does not result in water quality less than that prescribed in water quality control plans or policies.

USEPA water quality standards regulations require each state to adopt an "antidegradation" policy and specify the minimum requirements for the policy (40 CFR 131.12). Resolution No. 68-16 preceded the federal policy and applies to both ground and surface waters. The State Water Board has interpreted State Water Board Resolution No. 68-16 to incorporate the federal antidegradation policy. Therefore, the federal antidegradation policy must be followed where it is applicable. The federal antidegradation policy applies if a discharge or other activity, which began after 28 November 1975, will lower surface water quality. Application of the federal policy may be triggered by water quality impacts or mass loading impacts to receiving waters. Resolution No. 68-16 is Appendix Item 2; the federal policy is Appendix Item 39.

3. *State Water Board Resolution No. 74-43, The Water Quality Control Policy for the Enclosed Bays and Estuaries of California*

This policy was adopted by the State Water Board on 16 May 1974 and provides water quality principles and guidelines for the prevention of water quality degradation in enclosed bays and estuaries to protect the beneficial uses of such waters. The Regional Water Board must enforce the policy and take actions consistent with its provisions. (This policy does not apply to wastes from boats or land runoff except as specifically indicated for siltation and combined sewer flows.) See Appendix Item 3.

4. *State Water Board Resolution No. 75-58, Water Quality Control Policy on the Use and Disposal of Inland Waters Used for Powerplant Cooling*

This policy was adopted by the State Water Board in June 1975. Its purpose is to provide consistent principles and guidance for supplementary waste discharge requirements or other water quality control actions for thermal powerplants using inland waters for cooling. The Regional Water Board is responsible for its enforcement. See Appendix Item 4.

5. *State Water Board Resolution No. 77-1, Policy and Action Plan for Water Reclamation in California*

The policy was adopted 6 January 1977. Among other things, the policy requires the Regional Water Boards to conduct reclamation surveys and specifies reclamation actions to be implemented by the State and Regional Water Boards and other agencies. The policy and action plan are contained in the State Water Board report titled, *Policy and Action Plan for Water Reclamation in California*. See Appendix Item 5.

6. *State Water Board Resolution No. 87-22, Policy on the Disposal of Shredder Waste*

This State Water Board Resolution, adopted 19 March 1987, permits the disposal into certain landfills of wastes, produced by the mechanical destruction of car bodies, old appliances and similar castoffs, under specific conditions designated and enforced by the Regional Water Boards. See Appendix Item 6.

7. *State Water Board Resolution No. 88-23, Policy Regarding the Underground Storage Tanks Pilot Program*

The State Water Board adopted this policy on 18 February 1988. The policy implements a pilot program to fund oversight of remedial action at leaking underground storage tank sites, in cooperation with the California Department of Health Services. Oversight may be deferred to the Regional Water Boards. See Appendix Item 7.

8. *State Water Board Resolution No. 88-63, Sources of Drinking Water Policy*

This policy for water quality control, adopted on 19 May 1988, is essential to the designation of beneficial uses. The policy specifies that, except under specifically defined exceptions, all surface and ground waters of the state are to be protected as existing or potential sources of municipal and domestic supply. The specific exceptions include waters with existing high total dissolved solids concentrations (greater than 3000 mg/l), low sustainable yield (less than 200 gallons per day for a single well), waters with contamination that cannot be treated for domestic use using best management practices or best economically achievable treatment practices, waters within particular municipal, industrial and agricultural wastewater conveyance and holding facilities,

and regulated geothermal ground waters. Where the Regional Water Board finds that one of the exceptions applies, it may remove the municipal and domestic supply beneficial use designation for the particular body of water through a formal Basin Plan amendment and a public hearing, followed by approval of such an amendment by the State Water Board and the Office of Administrative Law. See Appendix Item 8.

9. *State Water Board Resolution No. 90-67, Pollutant Policy Document (PPD)*

The PPD was adopted by the State Water Board in 1990, as part of their overall Delta water rights proceedings. The PPD establishes state policy for water quality control to be used by the San Francisco Bay Regional Water Board and the Central Valley Regional Water Board in updating basin plans. The PPD requires the Central Valley Regional Water Board to develop a mass emission strategy for limiting loads of heavy metals, PAHs and selenium entering the Delta. It also requires that specific actions be taken to eliminate the discharge of chlorinated dibenzodioxins and dibenzofurans to the Delta. The PPD describes other actions for controlling antifouling compounds used on boats and for regulating dredging.

10. *State Water Board Resolution No. 92-49, Policies and Procedures for Investigation and Cleanup and Abatement of Discharges Under Water Code Section 13304*

This resolution contains policies and procedures for Regional Water Boards to follow for the oversight and regulation of investigations and cleanup and abatement activities from all types of discharge or threat of discharge subject to Section 13304 of the Water Code. It directs Regional Water Boards to ensure that dischargers are required to cleanup and to abate the effect of discharges. This cleanup and abatement shall be done in a manner that promotes attainment of background water quality, or the highest water quality which is reasonable if background levels of water quality cannot be restored. Any cleanup less stringent than background water quality shall be consistent with maximum benefit to the people of the state and not unreasonably affect present and anticipated beneficial uses of such water. See Appendix Item 9.

11. *State Water Board Resolution No. 93-62, Policy for Regulation of Discharges of Municipal Solid Waste*

The policy for water quality control, adopted by State Water Board on 17 June 1993, directs Regional Water Boards to amend waste discharge requirements for municipal solid waste landfills to incorporate pertinent provisions of the federal "Subtitle D" regulations under the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (40 CFR Parts 257 & 258). The majority of the provisions of the Subtitle D regulations become effective on 9 October 1993. Landfills which are subject to the Subtitle D regulations and the Policy are those which have accepted municipal solid waste on or after 9 October 1991. See Appendix Item 10.

12. *The Thermal Plan*

The Water Quality Control Plan for the Control of Temperature in the Coastal and Interstate Waters and Enclosed Bays and Estuaries of California was adopted by the State Water Board on 18 May 1972 and amended 18 September 1975. The plan specifies water quality objectives, effluent quality limits, and discharge prohibitions related to thermal characteristics of interstate waters and waste discharges. See Appendix Item 11. (Note: the State Water Board adopted Resolution No. 92-82 on 22 October 1992, approving an exception to the Thermal Plan for Sacramento Regional County Sanitation District. See Appendix Item 12.)

13. *The Delta Plan, Water Right Decision 1485, and the Water Quality Control Plan for Salinity*

In August 1978, the State Water Board adopted the Delta Plan and Water Right Decision 1485 (D-1485). The Delta Plan contained water quality standards, Delta outflow requirements and export constraints for the Delta. These standards, requirements, and constraints were then implemented in D-1485 by making them conditions of the water right permits for the Central Valley Project and the State Water Project.

When the Delta Plan and accompanying D-1485 were originally issued, the State Water Board committed itself to review the Delta Plan in about ten years. In 1986, the State Court of Appeal issued a decision addressing legal challenges to the Delta Plan and D-1485. The

Court directed the State Water Board to take a global view toward its dual responsibilities (water quality and water rights) to the State's water resources.

In response to the Court's decision, the State Water Board adopted the Water Quality Control Plan for Salinity in May 1991. The Delta salinity, temperature, and dissolved oxygen standards contained in the plan are identified in Table III-5 of Chapter III.

14. *Nonpoint Source Management Plan*

In 1988, the State Water Board adopted (Resolution 88-123) a Nonpoint Source Management Plan. The Plan describes three general management approaches that are to be used to address nonpoint source problems. These are 1) voluntary implementation of best management practices, 2) regulatory based encouragement of best management practices and 3) adopted effluent limits.

The approaches are listed in order of increasing stringency. In general the least stringent option that successfully protects or restores water quality should be employed, with more stringent measures considered if timely improvements in beneficial use protection are not achieved. The Regional Water Board will determine which approach or combination of approaches is most appropriate for any given nonpoint source problem.

Programs

1. *Discharges of Waste to Land, California Code of Regulations Title 23, Division 3, Chapter 15*

Chapter 15 includes regulations governing discharges of waste to land for treatment, storage, or disposal. The regulations cover landfills, surface impoundments, waste piles, land treatment units, mining waste management units and confined animal facilities. In addition, actions to clean up and abate conditions of pollution or nuisance at contaminated sites are covered by relevant portions of the regulations where contaminated materials are taken off-site for treatment, storage, or disposal and, as feasible, where wastes are contained or remain on-site at the completion of cleanup actions. The regulations classify wastes according to their threat to water quality, classify waste management units according to the degree of

protection that they provide for water quality, and provide siting, construction, monitoring, corrective action, closure and post closure maintenance criteria. Chapter 15 requirements are minimum standards for proper management of each waste category. These regulations require the complete containment of wastes which, if discharged to land for treatment, storage or disposal, have the potential to degrade the quality of water resources. Regional Water Boards may impose more stringent requirements to accommodate regional and site-specific conditions.

2. *Solid Waste Assessment Test (SWAT)*

Section 13273, added to the Water Code in 1985 (Assembly Bill 3525), required all owners of both active and inactive nonhazardous landfills to complete a Solid Waste Assessment (SWAT) to determine if hazardous waste constituents have migrated from the landfill into ground water. Pursuant to a list adopted by the State Water Board, 150 site owners statewide per year would complete this evaluation by 2001.

The Regional Water Board must review the SWAT report to determine whether any hazardous waste has migrated into ground water. If so, the Regional Water Board must notify the Department of Toxic Substances Control and the Integrated Waste Management Board, and take appropriate remedial action [CA Water Code Section 13273(e)].

3. *Toxic Pits Cleanup Act (TPCA)*

The Toxic Pits Cleanup Act of 1984 (Section 25208 et seq. of the Health and Safety Code) established a program to ensure that existing surface impoundments are either made safe or closed so that they do not pollute the waters of the state. The Act requires that all impoundments containing liquid hazardous wastes or hazardous wastes containing free liquids be retrofitted with a liner/leachate collection system, or closed by 1 July 1988. Surface impoundments containing hazardous wastes are prohibited within one-half mile upgradient from a potential source of drinking water. The law provided for certain exemptions.

4. *Underground Storage Tank (UST) Program*

The Central Valley UST Program is implemented under Division 20, Chapters 6.7

and 6.75 of the California Health and Safety Code and Title 23, Division 3, Chapter 16 of the California Code of Regulations. The program has two elements: leak prevention, which is implemented statewide by Local Implementing Agencies in 58 counties and 49 cities; and leak investigation and cleanup which is implemented by the Regional Water Board with assistance from the Local Implementing Agencies. Some Counties in the Central Valley Region are under contract with the State Water Board to provide investigation and cleanup oversight on some sites. These Counties are required to implement the requirements of the Basin Plan.

5. *Aboveground Petroleum Storage Act*

The Aboveground Petroleum Storage Act (Chapter 6.67, Division 20, Health and Safety Code) requires owners or operators of aboveground petroleum storage tanks to file a storage statement and pay a fee every two years (beginning 1 July 1990), to take specific actions to prevent spills, and, in certain instances, to implement a ground water monitoring program. Fees are used by staff to inspect facilities and review spill prevention plans. If a site is contaminated, staff oversee cleanup and the tank owner or operator is required to reimburse the Regional Water Board for reasonable costs for that oversight. There are approximately 8000 tank facilities in the region which have filed storage statements.

6. *Storm Water Regulations*

The 1987 Clean Water Act amendments required the USEPA to establish regulations to control storm water discharges associated with industrial activity; discharges from large (serving a population of 250,000 or more) and medium (serving a population of greater than 100,000 but less than 250,000) municipal separate storm sewer systems; and discharges from construction sites.

Federal regulations for storm water discharges were promulgated by the USEPA on 16 November 1990 (40 CFR Parts 122, 123, and 124). The regulations require large and medium size municipalities and specific categories of facilities, which discharge storm water associated with industrial activity, to obtain NPDES permits and to implement Best Available Technology Economically Achievable (BAT) and Best Conventional Pollutant Control

Technology (BCT) to reduce or eliminate industrial storm water pollution. Municipal permits establish controls to reduce/eliminate pollutants to the maximum extent possible (MEP) and to effectively prohibit illicit discharges to storm sewer systems.

In 1991 (amended in 1992), the State Water Board adopted a statewide general NPDES permit (Order No. 91-13-DWQ, General Permit No. CAS000001) for storm water discharges associated with industrial activities. The Order applies to facilities which discharge storm water to surface waters, either directly or through a storm drain system, excluding construction activities.

The State Water Board also adopted a statewide general NPDES permit (Order No. 92-08-DWQ, General Permit No. CAS000002) in 1992, which applies to construction projects resulting in land disturbance of five acres or greater.

7. *U.S. Department of Defense (DOD) Program*

The State and Regional Water Board's DOD Program provides regulatory oversight for the restoration and protection of surface and ground water quality during environmental cleanup of military facilities listed in the DOD/State Memorandum of Agreement (DSMOA). The State Water Board will enter into an interagency agreement with the Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) which, in turn, will enter into the DSMOA with DOD for cleanup oversight reimbursement. The State and Regional Water Boards provide regulatory oversight by their authority pursuant to Division 7 of the Water Code and Section 120(f) of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA), Title 42, U.S.C., Section 9620 (f). The DOD enters into a two-year cooperative agreement with DTSC to support DTSC's mandated mission to protect public health and the environment. The DOD Program should continue until DSMOA facility cleanups are completed (20 to 30 years) or Congress decides to terminate State oversight funding.

The cleanup of military facilities is required to be consistent with the applicable provisions of CERCLA (Section 120 relating to Federal Facilities), the Superfund Amendments and Reauthorization Act of 1986 (SARA), the National Contingency Plan, and State laws.

State Water Board Management Agency Agreements (MAAs), Memorandum of Agreement (MOA), and Memoranda of Understanding (MOUs)

The Regional Water Board abides by State Water Board agreements with federal and State agencies which have been formalized with either an MAA, MOA, or an MOU signed by the State Water Board.

1. *U. S. Forest Service Agreement*

On 26 February 1981 the State Water Board Executive Director signed an MAA with the U.S. Forest Service (USFS) which waives discharge requirements for certain USFS nonpoint source discharges provided that the Forest Service implements State Water Board approved best management practices (BMPs) and procedures and the provisions of the MAA. The MAA covers all USFS lands in California.

Implementation of the BMPs, in conjunction with monitoring and performance review requirements approved by the State and Regional Water Boards, is the primary method of meeting the Basin Plan's water quality objectives for the activities to which the BMPs apply. The MAA does not include USFS point source discharges and in no way limits the authority of the Regional Water Board to carry out its legal responsibilities for management or regulation of water quality. See Appendix Item 13.

2. *Department of Health Services*

On 27 January 1986, the State Water Board Chairperson signed an MOA with the Department of Health Services regarding the implementation of the hazardous waste program. The agreement covers surveillance and enforcement related to water quality at landfills, surface impoundments, waste piles, and land treatment facilities that treat, store, or dispose of hazardous waste. It also covers the issuance, modification, or denial of permits to facilities, including the revision of the water quality aspects of hazardous waste management facility siting, design, closure, post-closure, and surface and ground water monitoring and protection. See Appendix Item 14.

3. *Department of Health Services*

In 1988, the Chairman of the State Water Board signed an MOA with the Department of Health Services regarding the use of reclaimed water.

The MOA outlines the basic activities of the agencies, allocates primary areas of responsibility and authority between these agencies, and provides for methods and mechanisms to assure coordination for activities related to the use of reclaimed water. See Appendix Item 15.

4. *California Department of Forestry Agreement*

In February 1988, the State Water Board signed an MAA with the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CDFFP) and the California Board of Forestry (BOF), for the purpose of carrying out, pursuant to Section 208 of the Federal Clean Water Act, those portions of the State's Water Quality Management Plan (WQMP) related to controlling water quality impacts caused by silvicultural activities on nonfederal forest lands. As with the USFS MAA, the CDFFP agreement requires the Department to implement certain BMPs to protect water quality from timber harvest and associated activities. Approval of the MAA as a WQMP component by the USEPA results in the Regional Water Boards relinquishing some authority to issue WDRs for State timber operations (Public Resources Code Section 4514.3). However, CDF and the Regional and State Water Boards must still ensure that the operations incorporate BMPs and comply with applicable water quality standards. Appendix F of the MAA also calls for the preparation of a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) for the Regional Water Boards, the State Water Board, and the CDFFP to prescribe interagency procedures for implementing BMPs. See Appendix Item 16.

5. *Department of Conservation Agreement*

In March 1988, the State Water Board amended a February 1982 MOA with the State Department of Conservation, Division of Oil and Gas (CDOG), to regulate oil, gas, and geothermal fields' discharges. The agreement requires CDOG to notify the Regional Water Boards of all new operators, all pollution problems associated with operators, and proposed discharges. CDOG and Regional Water Boards must also work together, within certain time-lines, to review and prepare discharge permits. See Appendix Item 17.

6. *Department of Health Services/Department of Toxic Substances Control*

In July 1990, the State Water Board and the Department of Health Services, Toxic Substances Control Program (later reorganized into the Department of Toxic Substances Control) signed an MOU which explains the roles of the agencies (and of the Regional Water Boards) in the cleanup of hazardous waste sites. The MOU describes the protocol the agencies will follow to determine which agency will act as lead and which will act as support, the responsibilities of the agencies in their respective roles, the procedures the agencies will follow to ensure coordinated action, the technical and procedural requirements which each agency must satisfy, the procedures for enforcement and settlement, and the mechanism for dispute resolution. This MOU does not alter the Board's responsibilities with respect to water quality protection. See Appendix Item 18.

7. *Soil Conservation Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture*

On 31 July 1990, the State Water Board Executive Director signed an MOU with Soil Conservation Service (SCS), a technical agency for the U.S. Department of Agriculture. Through this MOU, State Water Board seeks to utilize the personnel and expertise of SCS in the development and implementation of water quality programs and projects. The goal is to accelerate implementation of best management practices and other nonpoint source pollution prevention measures. See Appendix Item 19.

8. *Environmental Affairs Agency, Air Resources Board, and California Integrated Waste Management Board*

On 27 August 1990, the State Water Board Executive Director signed an MOU with the Environmental Affairs Agency, Air Resources Board, and California Integrated Waste Management Board to enhance program coordination and reduce duplication of effort. This MOU consists of provisions describing the scope of the agreement (including definitions of the parties and issues to which the MOU applies), the principles which will govern the conduct of the parties, and the existing statutory framework. See Appendix Item 20.

9. *California Department of Pesticide Regulation*

On 23 December 1991, the State Water Board Chairman signed a MOU with the California Department of Pesticide Regulation (DPR) to ensure that pesticides registered in California are used in a manner that protects water quality and the beneficial uses of water while recognizing the need for pest control.

The State Water Board and nine Regional Water Boards are responsible for protecting the beneficial use of water in California and for controlling all discharges of waste into waters of the state while DPR is the lead agency for pesticide regulation in California.

This will be accomplished by implementing Best Management Practices (BMPs) initially upon voluntary compliance to be followed by regulatory-based encouragement of BMPs as circumstances dictate. Mandatory compliance will be based, whenever possible, on DPR's implementation of regulations and/or pesticide use permit requirements. However, the State Water Board and Regional Water Boards retain ultimate responsibility for compliance with water quality objectives. The agreement was revised on 19 January 1993 to facilitate implementation of the original agreement. See Appendix Item 21.

10. *Implementation of the San Joaquin Valley Drainage Program's Recommended Plan*

In January 1992, the State Water Board Chairman signed a MOU with the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, the U.S. Soil Conservation Service, the U.S. Geological Survey, the California Department of Fish and Game, and the Department of Food and Agriculture. The MOU is an agreement by the agencies to use the management plan described in the September 1990 final report of the San Joaquin Valley Drainage Program as a guide for remedying subsurface drainage and related problems. See Appendix Item 22.

11. *California Integrated Waste Management Board*

On 16 December 1992, the State Water Board Executive Director signed a MOU to address the Regional Water Board's review of Solid Waste Assessment Test reports. See Appendix Item 23.

12. *Bureau of Land Management*

On 27 January 1993, the State Water Board Vice Chairman signed a MOU to address nonpoint source water quality issues on public lands managed by the Bureau. See Appendix Item 24.

Control Action Considerations of the Central Valley Regional Water Board

Policies and Plans

The following policies were adopted, or are hereby adopted, by the Regional Water Board. The first four policies listed were adopted as part of the 1975 Basin Plan. Items 7 through 11 are new policies:

1. *Urban Runoff Policy*

- a. Subregional municipal and industrial plans are required to assess the impact of urban runoff on receiving water quality and consider abatement measures if a problem exists.
- b. Effluent limitations for storm water runoff are to be included in NPDES permits where it results in water quality problems.

2. *Wastewater Reuse Policy*

The Regional Water Board encourages the reclamation and reuse of wastewater, including treated ground water resulting from a cleanup action, where practicable and requires as part of a Report of Waste Discharge an evaluation of reuse and land disposal options as alternative disposal methods. Reuse options should include consideration of the following, where appropriate, based on the quality of the wastewater and the required quality for the specific reuses: industrial and municipal supply, crop irrigation, landscape irrigation, ground water recharge, and wetland restoration. Where studies show that Year-round or continuous reuse or land disposal of all of the wastewater is not practicable, the Regional Water Board will require dischargers to evaluate how reuse or land disposal can be optimized, such as consideration of reuse/disposal for part of the flow and seasonal reuse/disposal options (e.g., dry season land disposal).

3. *Controllable Factors Policy*

Controllable water quality factors are not allowed to cause further degradation of water quality in instances where other factors have already resulted in water quality objectives being exceeded. Controllable water quality factors are those actions, conditions, or circumstances resulting from human activities that may influence the quality of the waters of the State, that are subject to the authority of the State Water Board or Regional Water Board, and that may be reasonably controlled.

4. *The Water Quality Limited Segment Policy*

Additional treatment beyond minimum federal requirements will be imposed on dischargers to Water Quality Limited Segments. Dischargers will be assigned or allocated a maximum allowable load of critical pollutants so that water quality objectives can be met in the segment.

5. *Regional Water Board Resolution No. 70-118, Delegation of Duties and Powers to the Regional Water Board's Executive Officer*

In January 1970, the Regional Water Board adopted Resolution No. 70-118 which delegates certain duties and powers of the Board to its Executive Officer pursuant to Section 13223 of the California Water Code. See Appendix Item 25.

6. *Regional Water Board Resolution No. 96-147, San Joaquin River Agricultural Subsurface Drainage Policy*

- a. The control of toxic trace elements in agriculture subsurface drainage, especially selenium, is the first priority.
- b. The control of agricultural subsurface drainage will be pursued on a regional basis.
- c. The reuse of agricultural subsurface drainage will be encouraged, and actions that would limit or prohibit reuse discouraged.
- d. Of the two major options for disposal of salts produced by agricultural irrigation, export out of the basin has less potential for environmental impacts and, therefore, is the favored option. The San Joaquin River may continue to be used to remove salts from the

basin so long as water quality objectives are met.

- e. The valley-wide drain to carry the salts generated by agricultural irrigation out of the valley remains the best technical solution to the water quality problems of the San Joaquin River and Tulare Lake Basin. The Regional Water Board, at this time, feels that a valley-wide drain will be the only feasible, long-range solution for achieving a salt balance in the Central Valley. The Regional Water Board favors the construction of a valley-wide drain under the following conditions:

- All toxicants would be reduced to a level which would not harm beneficial uses of receiving waters.
- The discharge would be governed by specific discharge and receiving water limits in an NPDES permit.
- Long-term, continuous biological monitoring would be required.

- f. Optimizing protection of beneficial uses on a watershed basis will guide the development of actions to regulate agricultural subsurface drainage discharges.

- g. For regulation of selenium discharges, actions need to be focused on selenium load reductions.

7. *Antidegradation Implementation Policy*

The antidegradation directives of Section 13000 of the Water Code and State Water Board Resolution No. 68-16 ("Statement of Policy With Respect to Maintaining High Quality Waters in California") require that high quality waters of the State shall be maintained "consistent with the maximum benefit to the people of the State." The Regional Water Board applies these directives when issuing a permit, or in an equivalent process, regarding any discharge of waste which may affect the quality of surface or ground waters in the region.

Implementation of this policy to prevent or minimize surface and ground water degradation is a high priority for the Board. In nearly all cases, preventing pollution before it happens is much more cost-effective than cleaning up

pollution after it has occurred. Once degraded, surface water is often difficult to clean up when it has passed downstream. Likewise, cleanup of ground water is costly and lengthy due, in part, to its relatively low assimilative capacity and inaccessibility. The prevention of degradation is, therefore, an important strategy to meet the policy's objectives.

The Regional Water Board will apply 68-16 in considering whether to allow a certain degree of degradation to occur or remain. In conducting this type of analysis, the Regional Water Board will evaluate the nature of any proposed discharge, existing discharge, or material change therein, that could affect the quality of waters within the region. Any discharge of waste to high quality waters must apply best practicable treatment or control not only to prevent a condition of pollution or nuisance from occurring, but also to maintain the highest water quality possible consistent with the maximum benefit to the people of the State.

Pursuant to this policy, a Report of Waste Discharge, or any other similar technical report required by the Board pursuant to Water Code Section 13267, must include information regarding the nature and extent of the discharge and the potential for the discharge to affect surface or ground water quality in the region. This information must be presented as an analysis of the impacts and potential impacts of the discharge on water quality, as measured by background concentrations and applicable water quality objectives. The extent of information necessary will depend on the specific conditions of the discharge. For example, use of best professional judgment and limited available information may be sufficient to determine that ground or surface water will not be degraded. In addition, the discharger must identify treatment or control measures to be taken to minimize or prevent water quality degradation.

8. *Policy for Application of Water Quality Objectives*

Water quality objectives are defined in the Water Code as "the limits or levels of water quality constituents or characteristics which are established for the reasonable protection of beneficial uses of water or the prevention of nuisance within a specific area". (see Chapter III). Water quality objectives may be stated in either numerical or narrative form. Water

quality objectives apply to all waters within a surface water or ground water resource for which beneficial uses have been designated, rather than at an intake, wellhead or other point of consumption.

In conjunction with the issuance of NPDES and storm water permits, the Regional Water Board may designate mixing zones within which water quality objectives will not apply provided the discharger has demonstrated to the satisfaction of the Regional Water Board that the mixing zone will not adversely impact beneficial uses. If allowed, different mixing zones may be designated for different types of objectives, including, but not limited to, acute aquatic life objectives, chronic aquatic life objectives, human health objectives, and acute and chronic whole effluent toxicity objectives, depending in part on the averaging period over which the objectives apply. In determining the size of such mixing zones, the Regional Water Board will consider the applicable procedures and guidelines in EPA's Water Quality Standards Handbook and the Technical Support Document for Water Quality-based Toxics Control. Pursuant to EPA guidelines, mixing zones designated for acute aquatic life objectives will generally be limited to a small zone of initial dilution in the immediate vicinity of the discharge.

Where the Regional Water Board determines it is infeasible to achieve immediate compliance with water quality objectives adopted by the Regional Water Board or the State Water Board, or with water quality criteria adopted by the USEPA, or with an effluent limitation based on these objectives or criteria, the Regional Water Board may establish in NPDES permits a schedule of compliance. The schedule of compliance shall include a time schedule for completing specific actions that demonstrate reasonable progress toward the attainment of the objectives or criteria and shall contain a final compliance date, based on the shortest practicable time (determined by the Regional Water Board) required to achieve compliance. In no event shall an NPDES permit include a schedule of compliance that allows more than ten years (from the date of adoption of the objective or criteria) for compliance with water quality objectives, criteria or effluent limitations based on the objectives or criteria. Schedules of compliance are authorized by this provision only for those water quality objectives or criteria adopted after the effective date of this provision [25 September 1995].

State Water Board Resolution No. 68-16 requires the maintenance of the existing high quality of water (i.e., "background") unless a change in water quality "will be consistent with maximum benefit to the people of the State....". This policy explains how the Regional Water Board applies numerical and narrative water quality objectives to ensure the reasonable protection of beneficial uses of water and how the Regional Water Board applies Resolution No. 68-16 to promote the maintenance of existing high quality waters.

The numerical and narrative water quality objectives define the least stringent standards that the Regional Water board will apply to regional waters in order to protect beneficial uses. Numerical receiving water limitations will be established in Board orders for constituents and parameters which will, at a minimum, meet all applicable water quality objectives. However, the water quality objectives do not require improvement over naturally occurring background concentrations. In cases where the natural background concentration of a particular constituent exceeds an applicable water quality objective, the natural background concentration will be considered to comply with the objective. Consistent with Resolution No. 68-16, the Regional Water Board will impose more stringent numerical limitations (or prohibitions) which will maintain the existing quality of the receiving water, unless, pursuant to Resolution No. 68-16, some adverse change in water quality is allowed. Maintenance of the existing high quality of water means maintenance of "background" water quality conditions, i.e., the water quality found upstream or upgradient of the discharge, unaffected by other discharges. Therefore, the water quality objectives will define the least stringent limits which will be imposed and background defines the most stringent limits which will be imposed on ambient water quality.

This Basin Plan contains numerical water quality objectives for various constituents and parameters in Chapter III. Where numerical water quality objectives are listed, these are the limits necessary for the reasonable protection of beneficial uses of the water. In many instances, the Regional Water Board has not been able to adopt numerical water quality objectives for constituents or parameters, and instead has adopted narrative water quality objectives (e.g., for bacteria, chemical constituents, taste and odor, and toxicity). Where compliance with

these narrative objectives is required (i.e., where the objectives are applicable to protect specified beneficial uses), the Regional Water Board will, on a case-by-case basis, adopt numerical limitations in orders which will implement the narrative objectives.

To evaluate compliance with the narrative water quality objectives, the Regional Water Board considers, on a case-by-case basis, direct evidence of beneficial use impacts, all material and relevant information submitted by the discharger and other interested parties, and relevant numerical criteria and guidelines developed and/or published by other agencies and organizations (e.g., State Water Board, California Department of Health Services, California Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment, California Department of Toxic Substances Control, University of California Cooperative Extension, California Department of Fish and Game, USEPA, U.S. Food and Drug Administration, National Academy of Sciences, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Food and Agricultural Organization of the United Nations). In considering such criteria, the Board evaluates whether the specific numerical criteria, which are available through these sources and through other information supplied to the Board, are relevant and appropriate to the situation at hand and, therefore, should be used in determining compliance with the narrative objective. For example, compliance with the narrative objective for taste and odor may be evaluated by comparing concentrations of pollutants in water with numerical taste and odor thresholds that have been published by other agencies. This technique provides relevant numerical limits for constituents and parameters which lack numerical water quality objectives. To assist dischargers and other interested parties, the Regional Water Board staff has compiled many of these numerical water quality criteria from other appropriate agencies and organizations in the Central Valley Regional Water Board's staff report, *A Compilation of Water Quality Goals*. This staff report is updated regularly to reflect changes in these numerical criteria.

Where multiple toxic pollutants exist together in water, the potential for toxicologic interactions exists. On a case by case basis, the Regional Water Board will evaluate available receiving water and effluent data to determine whether there is a reasonable potential for interactive

toxicity. Pollutants which are carcinogens or which manifest their toxic effects on the same organ systems or through similar mechanisms will generally be considered to have potentially additive toxicity. The following formula will be used to assist the Regional Water Board in making determinations:

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \frac{[\text{Concentration of Toxic Substance}]_i}{[\text{Toxicologic Limit for Substance in Water}]_i} < 1.0$$

The concentration of each toxic substance is divided by its toxicologic limit. The resulting ratios are added for substances having similar toxicologic effects and, separately, for carcinogens. If such a sum of ratios is less than one, an additive toxicity problem is assumed not to exist. If the summation is equal to or greater than one, the combination of chemicals is assumed to present an unacceptable level of toxicologic risk. For example, monitoring shows that ground water beneath a site has been degraded by three volatile organic chemicals, A, B, and C, in concentrations of 0.3, 0.4, and 0.04 µg/l, respectively. Toxicologic limits for these chemicals are 0.7, 3, and 0.06 µg/l, respectively. Individually, no chemical exceeds its toxicologic limit. However, an additive toxicity calculation shows:

$$\frac{0.3}{0.7} + \frac{0.4}{3} + \frac{0.04}{0.06} = 1.2$$

The sum of the ratios is greater than unity (>1.0); therefore, the additive toxicity criterion has been violated. The concentrations of chemicals A, B, and C together present a potentially unacceptable level of toxicity.

For permitting purposes, it is important to clearly define how compliance with the narrative toxicity objectives will be measured. Staff is currently working with the State Water Board to develop guidance on this issue.

9. *Policy for Investigation and Cleanup of Contaminated Sites*

The Regional Water Board's strategy for managing contaminated sites is guided by several important principles, which are based on Water Code Sections 13000 and 13304, the Chapter 15 regulations and State Water Board Resolution Nos. 68-16 and 92-49:

a. State Water Board Policy & Regulation

The Regional Water Board will require conformance with the provisions of State Water Board Resolution No. 68-16 in all cases and will require conformance with applicable or relevant provisions of 23 CCR, Division 3, Chapter 15 to the extent feasible. These provisions direct the Regional Water Board to ensure that dischargers are required to clean up and abate the effect of discharges in a manner that promotes attainment of background water quality, or the highest water quality which is reasonable and protective of beneficial uses if background levels of water quality cannot be restored.

b. Site Investigation

An investigation of soil and ground water to determine full horizontal and vertical extent of pollution is necessary to ensure that cleanup plans are protective of water quality. The goal of the investigation shall be to determine where concentrations of constituents of concern exceed beneficial use protective levels (water quality objectives) and, additionally, where constituents of concern exceed background levels (the zero-impact line). Investigations shall extend off-site as necessary to determine the full extent of the impact.

c. Source Removal/Containment

Immediate removal or containment of the source, to the extent practicable, should be implemented where necessary to prevent further spread of pollution as well as being among the most cost-effective remediation actions. The effectiveness of ground water cleanup techniques often depends largely on the completeness of source removal or containment efforts (e.g., removal of significantly contaminated soil or pockets of dense non-aqueous phase liquids).

d. Cleanup Level Approval

Ground water and soil cleanup levels are approved by the Regional Water Board. The Executive Officer may approve cleanup levels as appropriately delegated by the Board.

e. Site Specificity

Given the extreme variability of hydrogeologic conditions in the Region, cleanup levels must reflect site-specific factors.

f. Discharger Submittals

The discharger must submit the following information for consideration by the Regional Water Board in establishing cleanup levels which meet the criteria contained in 23 CCR Section 2550.4(c) through (g):

- i. water quality assessment to determine impacts and threats to the quality of water resources;
- ii. risk assessment to determine impacts and threats to human health and the environment; and
- iii. feasibility study of cleanup alternatives which compare effectiveness, cost, and time to achieve cleanup levels. Cleanup levels covered by this study shall include, at a minimum, background levels, levels which meet all applicable water quality objectives and which do not pose significant risks to health or the environment, and an alternate cleanup level which is above background levels and which also meets the requirements as specified in paragraphs g. (v) and (vi) below.

g. Ground Water Cleanup Levels

Ground water cleanup levels shall be established based on:

- i. background concentrations of individual pollutants;
- ii. applicable water quality objectives to protect designated beneficial uses of the water body, as listed in Chapters II and III;
- iii. concentrations which do not pose a significant risk to human health or the environment, considering risks from toxic constituents to be additive across all media of exposure and, in the

absence of scientifically valid data to the contrary, additive for all constituents having similar toxicologic effects or having carcinogenic effects; and

- iv. technologic and economic feasibility of attaining background concentrations and of attaining concentrations lower than defined by (ii) and (iii) above.

Factors in (i) through (iv) above are used to establish ground water cleanup levels according to the following principles:

- v. Pursuant to 23 CCR Section 2550.4, the Regional Water Board establishes cleanup levels that are protective of human health, the environment and beneficial uses of waters of the state, as measured by compliance with (ii) and (iii) above, and are equal to background concentrations if background levels are technologically and economically feasible to achieve. If background levels are infeasible to achieve, cleanup levels are set between background concentrations and concentrations that meet all criteria in (ii) and (iii) above. Within this concentration range, cleanup levels must be set at the lowest concentrations that are technologically and economically achievable. In no case are cleanup levels established below natural background concentrations.
- vi. Technologic feasibility is determined by assessing the availability of technologies which have been shown to be effective in reducing the concentrations of the constituents of concern to the established cleanup levels. Bench-scale and/or pilot-scale studies may be necessary to make this feasibility assessment in the context of constituent, hydrogeologic, and other site-specific factors. Economic feasibility does not refer to the subjective measurement of the ability of the discharger to pay the costs of cleanup, but rather to the objective balancing of the incremental benefit of attaining more stringent levels of constituents of concern as compared with the incremental cost of achieving

those levels. Factors to be considered in the establishment of cleanup levels greater than background are listed in 23 CCR, Section 2550.4(d). The discharger's ability to pay is one factor to be considered in determining whether the cleanup level is *reasonable*. However, availability of economic resources to the discharger is primarily considered in establishing reasonable schedules for compliance with cleanup levels.

- vii. Compliance with (iii) above shall be determined through risk assessments performed by the discharger, using the most current procedures authorized by the Department of Toxic Substances Control, the Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment, or the USEPA. The Regional Water Board is not the lead agency for specifying risk assessment procedures or for reviewing risk assessments. The Board will assist the discharger, as necessary, in obtaining the appropriate, most current procedures from the above listed agencies. To prevent duplication of effort, the Board will rely on the Department of Toxic Substances Control, the Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment, or appropriately designated local health agencies to review and evaluate the adequacy of health and environmental risk assessments. The Board will assist the discharger, as necessary, in determining which of these agencies will review the risk assessments for a particular site. Priority will be given to those agencies that are already involved with the assessment and cleanup of the site.

h. Compliance with Ground Water Cleanup Levels

To protect potential beneficial uses of the water resource as required by Water Code Sections 13000 and 13241, compliance with ground water cleanup levels must occur throughout the pollutant plume.

i. Modifying Ground Water Cleanup Levels

The Regional Water Board may consider modifying site-specific ground water cleanup levels (that have been determined pursuant to subsection (g) above) that are more stringent than applicable water quality objectives, only when a final remedial action plan has been pursued in good faith, and all of the following conditions are met:

- i. Modified cleanup levels meet the conditions listed in g(ii) and (iii) above
- ii. An approved cleanup program has been fully implemented and operated for a period of time which is adequate to understand the hydrogeology of the site, pollutant dynamics, and the effectiveness of available cleanup technologies;
- iii. Adequate source removal and/or isolation is undertaken to eliminate or significantly reduce future migration of constituents of concern to ground water;
- iv. The discharger has demonstrated that no significant pollutant migration will occur to other underlying or adjacent aquifers;
- v. Ground water pollutant concentrations have reached asymptotic levels using appropriate technology;
- vi. Optimization of the existing technology has occurred and new technologies have been evaluated and applied where economically and technologically feasible; and
- vii. Alternative technologies for achieving lower constituent levels have been evaluated and are inappropriate or not economically feasible.

j. Soil Cleanup Levels

For soils which threaten the quality of water resources, soil cleanup levels should be equal to background concentrations of the individual leachable/mobile constituents, unless background levels are technologically or economically infeasible to achieve. Where background levels are infeasible to achieve, soil cleanup levels are established to ensure that remaining leachable/mobile

constituents of concern will not threaten to cause ground water to exceed applicable ground water cleanup levels, and that remaining constituents do not pose significant risks to health or the environment. The Regional Water Board will consider water quality, health, and environmental risk assessment methods, as long as such methods are based on site-specific field data, are technically sound, and promote attainment of all of the above principles.

k. Verification of Soil Cleanup

Verification of soil cleanup generally requires verification sampling and follow-up ground water monitoring. The degree of required monitoring will reflect the amount of uncertainty associated with the soil cleanup level selection process. Follow-up ground water monitoring may be limited where residual concentrations of leachable/mobile constituents in soils are not expected to impact ground water quality.

l. Remaining Constituents

Where leachable/mobile concentrations of constituents of concern remain on-site in concentrations which threaten water quality, the Regional Water Board will require implementation of applicable provisions of Chapter 15. Relevant provisions of Chapter 15 which may not be directly applicable, but which address situations similar to those addressed at the cleanup site will be implemented to the extent feasible, in conformance with Title 23, CCR, Section 2511(d). This may include, but is not limited to, surface or subsurface barriers or other containment systems, pollutant immobilization, toxicity reduction, and financial assurances.

10. *Policy for Obtaining Salt Balance in the San Joaquin Valley*

It is the policy of the Regional Water Board to encourage construction of facilities to convey agricultural drain water from the San Joaquin and Tulare Basins. A valley-wide conveyance facility for agricultural drain waters impaired by high levels of salt is the only feasible, long-range solution for achieving a salt balance in the Central Valley.

11. *Watershed Policy*

The Regional Water Board supports implementing a watershed based approach to addressing water quality problems. The State and Regional Water Boards are in the process of developing a proposal for integrating a watershed approach into the Board's programs. The benefits to implementing a watershed based program would include gaining participation of stakeholders and focusing efforts on the most important problems and those sources contributing most significantly to those problems.

Regional Water Board Memoranda of Understanding (MOU) and Memoranda of Agreement (MOA)

1. *U.S. Bureau of Land Management*

In September 1985, the Regional Water Board Executive Officer signed MOUs with the three U.S. Bureau of Land Management Districts in the Central Valley (i.e., the Ukiah District, the Susanville District, and the Bakersfield District). The MOUs, which are identical for each District, aim at improving coordination between the two agencies for the control of water quality problems resulting from mineral extraction activities on BLM administered lands. See Appendix Items 26 through 28.

2. *U. S. Bureau of Reclamation Agreement*

On 2 July 1969, the Regional Water Board signed an MOA with the Bureau of Reclamation to schedule water releases from the New Melones Unit of the Central Valley Project to maintain an oxygen level at or above 5 mg/l in the Stanislaus River downstream of the unit and to not exceed a mean monthly TDS concentration of 500 mg/l in the San Joaquin River immediately below the mouth of the Stanislaus River. The MOA's water quality requirements are subject to some conditions. See Appendix Item 29.

3. *California Department of Fish and Game and Mosquito Abatement and Vector Control Districts of the South San Joaquin Valley*

On 25 February 1993, the Regional Water Board Executive Officer signed an MOU with the California Department of Fish and Game and 11 mosquito abatement and vector control districts of the south

San Joaquin valley regarding vegetation management in wastewater treatment facilities. The MOU designates the Districts as lead agencies in determining the adequacy of vegetation management operations in abating mosquito breeding sources. Included in the MOU are the definition of vegetative management operations and conditions to protect nesting birds, eggs, and nests. See Appendix Item 30.

Regional Water Board Waivers

State law allows Regional Water Boards to waive WDRs for a specific discharge or types of discharges

where it is not against the public interest (Water Code Section 13269).

On 26 March 1982, the Regional Water Board adopted Resolution No. 82-036 to waive WDRs for certain discharges. The types of discharges and the limitations on the discharges which must be maintained if the waivers are to apply are shown in Table IV-1. These waivers are conditional and may be terminated at any time.

The Regional Water Board adopted two additional conditional waivers, one for retail fertilizer facilities (Resolution No. 89-247) and one for pesticide applicator facilities (Resolution No. 90-34). The waivers and their attached conditions are included in the appendix (Items 31 and 32).

TABLE IV-1

WASTE DISCHARGE REQUIREMENT WAIVER AND LIMITATIONS

<u>TYPE OF WASTE DISCHARGE</u>	<u>LIMITATIONS</u>
Air conditioner, cooling and elevated temperature waters	Small volumes which will not change temperature of receiving water more than 1 degree C.
Drilling muds	Discharged to a sump with two feet of freeboard. Sump must be dried by evaporation or pumping. Drilling-mud may remain in sump only if discharger demonstrates that it is nontoxic. Sump area shall be restored to pre-construction state within 60 days of completion or abandonment of well.
Clean oil containing no toxic materials	Used for beneficial purposes such as dust control, weed control and mosquito abatement where it cannot reach state waters.
Inert solid wastes (per California Code of Regulations, Section 2524)	Good disposal practices.
Test pumpings of fresh water wells.	When assurances are provided that pollutants are neither present nor added.
Storm water runoff	Where no water quality problems are contemplated and no federal NPDES permit is required.
Erosion from development	Where BMP plans have been formulated and implemented.
Pesticide rinse waters from applicators	Where discharger complies with Regional Water Board guidance.
Confined animal wastes	Where discharger complies with Regional Water Board guidance.
Minor stream channel alterations and suction dredging	Where regulated by Department of Fish and Game agreements.
Small, short-term sand and gravel operations	All operations and wash waters confined to land.
Small, metal mining operations	All operations confined to land, no toxic materials utilized in recovery operations.

IMPLEMENTATION

IV-22.00

1 September 1998

TABLE IV-1 WASTE DISCHARGE REQUIREMENT
WAIVER AND LIMITATIONS (continued)

<u>TYPE OF WASTE DISCHARGE</u>	<u>LIMITATIONS</u>
Swimming pool discharges	Where adequate dilution exists or where beneficial uses are not affected.
Food processing wastes spread on land	Where an operating/maintenance plan has been approved.
Construction	Where BMPs are used.
Agricultural commodity wastes	Small, seasonal and confined to land.
Industrial wastes utilized for soil amendments	Where industry certifies its nontoxic content and BMPs are used for application.
Timber harvesting	Operating under an approved timber harvest plan.
Minor hydro projects	Operating under water rights permit from State Water Board or Department of Fish and Game agreement and no water quality impacts anticipated.
Irrigation return water (tail-water)	Operating to minimize sediment to meet Basin Plan turbidity objectives and to prevent concentrations of materials toxic to fish or wildlife.
Projects where application for Water Quality Certification is required	Where project (normally minor construction) is not expected to have a significant water quality effect and project complies with Dept. of Fish and Game agreements.
Septic tank/leachfield systems	Where project has county permit and county uses Water Board Guidelines.

The Regional Water Board may, after compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), allow short-term variances from Basin Plan provisions, if determined to be necessary to implement control measures for vector and weed control, pest eradication, or fishery management which are being conducted to fulfill statutory requirements under California's Fish and Game, Food and Agriculture, or Health and Safety Codes. In order for the Regional Water Board to determine if a variance is appropriate, agencies proposing such activities must submit to the Regional Water Board project-specific information, including measures to mitigate adverse impacts.

Regional Water Board Prohibitions

The Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act allows the Regional Water Board to prohibit certain discharges (Water Code Section 13243). Prohibitions may be revised, rescinded, or adopted as necessary. The prohibitions applicable to the Sacramento and

San Joaquin River Basins are identified and described below.

[NOTE: Costs incurred by any unit of local government for a new program or increased level of service for compliance with discharge prohibitions in the Basin Plan do not require reimbursement by the State per Section 2231 of the Revenue and Taxation Code, because the Basin Plan implements a mandate previously enacted by statute, Chapter 482, Statutes of 1969.]

1. Water Bodies

Water bodies for which the Regional Water Board has held that the direct discharge of wastes is inappropriate as a permanent disposal method include sloughs and streams with intermittent flow or limited dilution capacity. The direct discharge of municipal and industrial wastes (excluding storm water discharges) into the following specific water bodies has been prohibited, as noted:

1 September 1998

IV-23.00

IMPLEMENTATION

American River, including Lake Natoma (from Folsom Dam to mouth)

Clear Lake

Folsom Lake

Fourteen Mile Slough at Stockton N.W. and Lincoln Village

Lake Berryessa

Middle Fork, Feather River (from Dellecker to Lake Oroville)

Lake Oroville

Sacramento River (from confluence with the Feather River to the Freeport Bridge). [Note: There are two exceptions, (1) discharges of combined municipal waste and storm runoff flow from the City of Sacramento, and (2) discharges of treated/disinfected municipal waste from the City of West Sacramento when the City's Clarksburg outfall line is at its maximum hydraulic capacity and when Sacramento River flow is greater than 80,000 cfs, are not subject to the prohibition. The discharges are to be controlled through waste discharge requirements.]

Sacramento Ship Channel and Turning Basin

Shasta Lake

Sugar Cut at Tracy

Thermalito Forebay and Afterbay

Tulloch Reservoir

Whiskeytown Reservoir

Willow Creek-Bass Lake in Madera County (the prohibition is for sewage effluent only)

2. *Leaching Systems*

Discharge of wastes from new and existing leaching and percolation systems has been prohibited by the Regional Water Board in the following areas:

Amador City, Amador County (Adopted by Regional Water Board Order No. 73-129; effective as of 12/15/72)

Martell Area, Amador County (73-129; 12/15/72)

Shasta Dam Area Public Utilities District, Shasta County (73-129; 12/15/72)

Vallecito Area, Calaveras County (73-129; 12/15/72)

West Point Area, Calaveras County (73-129; 12/15/72)

Celeste Subdivision Area, Merced County (73-129; 12/15/72)

Snelling Area, Merced County (73-129; 12/15/72, and amended 74-126; 12/14/73)

North San Juan, Nevada County (74-123; 12/14/73)

Arnold Area, Calaveras County (74-124, 75-180; 12/14/73, 6/25/75)

Contra Costa County Sanitation District No. 15, Contra Costa County (74-125; 12/14/73)

Madera County Service Area No. 2, Bass Lake (74-127; 12/14/73)

Madera County Service Area No. 3, Parksedale (74-128; 12/14/73)

Coulterville County Service Area No. 1, Mariposa County (75-070; 3/21/75)

Midway Community Services District, Merced County (75-072; 3/21/75)

Adin Community Services District, Modoc County (75-272 11/21/75)

Fall River Mills, Community Services District, Shasta County (75-273; 11/21/75)

Bell Road Community, including Panorama and Pearl, Placer County (75-274; 11/21/75)

Nice and Lucerne, Lake County (76-58; 2/27/76)

Courtland Sanitation District, Sacramento County (76-59; 2/27/76)

Six-Mile Village, Calaveras County (76-60; 2/27/76)

Communities of Clearlake Highlands and Clearlake Park, Lake County (76-89; 3/26/76)

Taylorsville County Service Area, Plumas County (76-129; 5/28/76)

Community of South Lakeshore Assessment District, Lake County (76-215; 9/24/76)

Anderson-Cottonwood Irrigation District, Community of Cottonwood, Shasta County (76-230; 10/22/76)

Daphnedale Area, Modoc County (76-231; 10/22/76)

Chico Urban Area, Butte County (90-126; 4/27/90)

3. *Petroleum*

The Regional Water Board has prohibited the discharge of oil or any residuary product of petroleum to the waters of the State, except in accordance with waste discharge requirements or other provisions of Division 7, California Water Code.

4. *Vessel Wastes*

The Regional Water Board has prohibited the discharge of toilet wastes from the vessels of all houseboat rental businesses on Shasta Lake, Clear Lake, and the Delta.

5. *Pesticides*

Effective immediately for molinate and thiobencarb and on 1 January 1991 for carbofuran, malathion and methyl parathion, the discharge of irrigation return flows containing these pesticides is prohibited unless the discharger is following a management practice approved by the Board. Proposed management practices for these pesticides will not be approved unless they are expected to meet the performance goals contained in the following table. Also, the management practices must ensure that discharges of thiobencarb to waters designated as municipal or domestic water supplies will comply with the 1.0 µg/l water quality objective for this pesticide. It is important to note that the performance goals in this timetable are interim in nature and while they are based on the best available information, they are not to be equated with concentrations that meet the water quality objectives. The intent of the performance goals is to bring concentrations being found in surface waters down to levels that

approach compliance with the objectives. Future performance goals and numerical objectives will be set using the results of ongoing evaluations of the risks posed by these pesticides. Future performance goals may also be site-specific to take into consideration the additive impacts of more than one pesticide being present in a water body at the same time. The Board will reexamine the progress of the control effort for these pesticides in 1993 and will set performance goals intended to bring concentrations of these five pesticides into full compliance with all objectives by 1995.

Performance Goals¹ for Management Practices in µg/l

Pesticide	YEAR			
	1990	1991	1992	1993
Carbofuran	D	0.4	0.4	R
Malathion	I	0.1	R	R
Molinate	30.0	20.0	10.0	R
Methyl parathion	D	0.26	0.13	R
Thiobencarb	3.0	1.5	R	R

¹ Performance goals are daily maxima and apply to all waters designated as freshwater habitat.

D = No numerical goal - control practices under development

I = No numerical goal - sources of discharge to be identified by special study

R = The Regional Board will review the latest technical and economic information determine if the performance goal should be adjusted

6. *San Joaquin River Subsurface Agricultural Drainage*

- a. The discharge of agricultural subsurface drainage from the Grassland watershed to the San Joaquin River or its tributaries from any on-farm subsurface drain, open drain, or similar drain system is prohibited, unless such discharge began prior to the effective date of this amendment (10 January 1997) or unless such discharge is governed by waste discharge requirements.

- b. The discharge of agricultural subsurface drainage water to Salt Slough and wetland water supply channels identified in Appendix 40 is prohibited after 10 January 1997, unless water quality objectives for selenium are being met. This prohibition may be reconsidered if public or private interests prevent the implementation of a separate conveyance facility for agricultural subsurface drainage.
- c. The discharge of agricultural subsurface drainage water to Mud Slough (north) and the San Joaquin River from Sack Dam to the mouth of the Merced River is prohibited after 1 October 2010, unless water quality objectives for selenium are being met. This prohibition may be reconsidered if public or private interests prevent the implementation of a separate conveyance facility for agricultural subsurface drainage to the San Joaquin River.
- d. The discharge of selenium from agricultural subsurface drainage systems in the Grassland watershed to the San Joaquin River is prohibited in amounts exceeding 8,000 lbs/year for all water year types beginning 10 January 1997.
- e. Activities that increase the discharge of poor quality agricultural subsurface drainage are prohibited.

Regional Water Board Guidelines

The Regional Water Board has adopted guidance for certain types of dischargers which is designed to reduce the possibility that water quality will be impaired. The Regional Water Board may still impose discharge requirements. All of the Guidelines are contained in the Appendix (Items 33 through 37). Currently, the following Guidelines apply to the Sacramento and San Joaquin River Basins:

1. *Wineries*

This Guideline contains criteria for protecting beneficial uses and preventing nuisance from the disposal to land of stillage wastes.

2. *Erosion and Sedimentation*

This Guideline identifies practices to be implemented by local government to reduce erosion and sedimentation from construction activities.

3. *Small Hydroelectric Facilities*

This Guideline specifies measures to protect water quality from temperature, turbidity, and dissolved oxygen effects from the construction and operation of small hydroelectric Facilities.

4. *Disposal from Land Developments*

This Guideline contains criteria for the siting of septic tanks, sewer lines, leach fields, and seepage pits to protect water quality.

5. *Mining*

This Guideline identifies actions that the Regional Water Board takes to address the water quality problems associated with mining. It requires owners and operators of active mines to prepare plans for closure and reclamation, but it does not specify any practices or criteria for mine operators.

Nonpoint Source Action Plans

Section 208 of the 1972 Amendments to the Federal Clean Water Act resulted in monies being made available to states to address nonpoint source problems. The Regional Water Board used 208 grant funds to develop its mining and erosion/sedimentation guidelines, among other things. It also encouraged local governments to make use of the 208 program. As a result, several counties in the sub-basins developed action plans to control nonpoint source problems which affected them. The Regional Water Board action plans are described in Table IV-2.

TABLE IV-2
NONPOINT SOURCE ACTION PLANS

<u>LOCATION</u>	<u>RECOMMENDED ACTION</u>
Shasta County	Best Management Practices (BMPs) for control of erosion from land development (adopted 1980)
Nevada County	BMPs for erosion and individual wastewater disposal systems (adopted 1980)
Placer County	BMPs for erosion and installation of individual wastewater disposal systems (adopted 1980)
Lake County	BMPs for erosion and creek bed management (adopted 1979)
Communities of Paradise and Magalia (Butte County)	BMPs for wastewater management (adopted 1979)
Solano County	BMPs for surface water runoff (adopted 1979)
Upper Putah Creek Watershed (Lake, Napa Counties)	Strategies and recommendations for addressing problems from geothermal development, abandoned mines, and individual wastewater disposal systems (adopted 1981)
Fall River (Shasta County)	BMPs for livestock grazing and individual wastewater disposal systems (adopted 1982)
Plumas County	BMPs for erosion control (adopted 1980)
Mariposa County	BMPs for individual wastewater disposal systems for area north of the community of Mariposa; BMPs for erosion and sedimentation in the Stockton Creek Watershed (adopted 1979)
Merced County	Lake Yosemite Area -- BMPs for individual wastewater disposal systems (adopted 1979)

ACTIONS RECOMMENDED FOR IMPLEMENTATION BY OTHER ENTITIES

Consistent with the Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act, the Basin Plan may identify control actions recommended for implementation by agencies other than the Regional Water Board [Water Code Section 13242(a)].

Recommended for Implementation by the State Water Board

Interbasin Transfer of Water

Before granting new permits for water storage or diversion which involves interbasin transfer of water, the State Water Board should require the applicant to evaluate the alternatives listed below. Permits should not be approved unless the alternatives have been thoroughly investigated and ruled out for social, environmental, or economic reasons.

1. In situations where wastewater is discharged to marine waters without intervening beneficial use (for example, the San Francisco Bay Area and most of Southern California), increase the

1 September 1998

IV-27.00

IMPLEMENTATION

- efficiency of municipal, industrial, and agricultural water use.
- 2. Make optimum use of existing water resource facilities.
- 3. Store what would otherwise be surplus wet-weather Delta outflows in off-stream reservoirs.
- 4. Conjunctively use surface and ground waters.
- 5. Give careful consideration to the impact on basin water quality of inland siting of power plants.
- 6. Make maximum use of reclaimed water while protecting public health and avoiding severe economic penalties to a particular user or class of users.

Trans-Delta Water Conveyance

The State Water Board should adopt the position that those proposing trans-Delta water conveyance facilities must clearly demonstrate the following, if such a facility is constructed:

- 1. Protection of all beneficial uses in the Delta that may be affected by such a facility;
- 2. Protection of all established water quality objectives that may be affected by such a facility; and,
- 3. Adherence to the six alternatives previously identified for Interbasin Transfer of Water.

Water Quality Planning

A core planning group has been established within the staff of the State Water Board, which has the responsibility to integrate the statewide planning of water quality and water resources management.

Water Intake Studies

The State Water Board should coordinate studies to assess the costs and benefits of moving planned diversions from the eastern side of the Central Valley to points further west, probably to the Delta, to allow east side waters to flow downstream for uses of fishery enhancement, recreation, and quality control. Specific study items should include:

- 1. Possible intake relocations;
- 2. Conveyance and treatment required to accommodate such relocations;

- 3. Direct and indirect (including consumer and environmental) costs and benefits of relocation; and,
- 4. Institutional problems.

The State Water Board should request voluntary participation in the studies by agencies planning diversions, but should take appropriate action through its water rights authority if such participation cannot be obtained. At a minimum, participation would be required of the San Francisco Water Department and East Bay Municipal Utility District.

Subsurface Agricultural Drainage

- 1. The Regional Board will request that the State Water Board use its water rights authority to preclude the supplying of water to specific lands, if water quality objectives are not met by the specified compliance dates and Regional Board administrative remedies fail to achieve compliance.
- 2. The State Water Board should work jointly with the Regional Water Board in securing compliance with the 2 µg/l selenium objective for managed- wetlands in the Grassland area.
- 3. The State Water Board should also consider grant funds to implement a cost share program to install a number of flow monitoring stations within the Grassland area to assist in better defining the movement of pollutants through the area.
- 4. The State Water Board should continue to consider the Drainage Problem Area in the San Joaquin Basin and the upper Panoche watershed (in the Tulare Basin) as priority nonpoint source problems in order to make USEPA nonpoint source control funding available to the area.
- 5. The State Water Board should seek funding for research and demonstration of advanced technology that will be needed to achieve final selenium loads necessary to meet selenium water quality objectives.

Recommended for Implementation by Other Agencies

Water Resources Facilities

1. Consideration should be given to the construction of a storage facility to store surplus wet-weather Delta outflows. Construction should be contingent on studies demonstrating that some portion of wet-weather Delta outflow is truly surplus to the Bay-Delta system.
2. Consideration should be given to the use of excess capacity in west San Joaquin Valley conveyances, or of using a new east valley conveyance to:
 - a. Augment flows and improve water quality in the San Joaquin River and southern Delta with the goal of achieving water quality as described in Table IV-3.

TABLE IV-3

TDS MG/L	TYPE OF YEAR ¹			
	CRITICAL ²	DRY ³	NORMAL ⁴	WET
Max. 3-day (arith. avg.)	500	500	500	500
Maximum (annual avg.)	385	385	385	285
Max. May-Sep (arith. avg.)	300	250	250	250
Max. 3-Day May-Sep (arith. Avg.)	450	350	350	350
¹ Relative to unimpaired runoff to Delta Based on 1922 - 1971 period. See definitions in Figure III-2 ² Less than 57% , or less than 70% when preceding year critical ³ Less than 70%, or less than 90% when preceding year critical ⁴ Greater than 125%				

- b. Prevent further ground water overdrafts and associated quality problems.

Agricultural Drainage Facilities

Facilities should be constructed to convey agricultural drain water from the San Joaquin and Tulare Basins. It is the policy of the Regional Water

Board to encourage construction. The discharge must comply with water quality objectives of the receiving water body.

Subsurface Agricultural Drainage

1. The entire drainage issue is being handled as a watershed management issue. The entities in the Drainage Problem Area and entities within the remainder of the Grassland watershed need to establish a regional entity with authority and responsibility for drain water management.
2. The regional drainage entity and agricultural water districts should consider adopting economic incentive programs as a component of their plans to reduce pollutant loads. Economic incentives can be an effective institutional means of promoting on-farm changes in drainage and water management.
3. If fragmentation of the parties that generate, handle and discharge agricultural subsurface drainage jeopardizes the achievement of water quality objectives, the Regional Water Board will consider petitioning the Legislature for the formation of a regional drainage district.
4. The Legislature should consider putting additional bond issues before the voters to provide low interest loans for agricultural water conservation and water quality projects and incorporating provisions that would allow recipients to be private landowners, and that would allow irrigation efficiency improvement projects that reduce drainage discharges to be eligible for both water conservation funds and water quality facilities funds.
5. The San Joaquin Valley Drainage Implementation Program or other appropriate agencies should continue to investigate the alternative of a San Joaquin River Basin drain to move the existing discharge point for poor quality agricultural subsurface drainage to a location where its impact on water quality is less.
6. The selenium water quality objective for the wetland channels can not be achieved without removal of drainage water from these channels. The present use of the Grassland channels has developed over a 30-year period through agreements between the dischargers, water and irrigation districts, the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation, the California Department of Water Resources, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, the California Department of Fish and Game, the Grassland Water District and the

Grassland Resource Conservation District. Because each entity shared in the development of the present drainage routing system, each shares the responsibility for implementation of a wetlands bypass.

CONTINUOUS PLANNING FOR IMPLEMENTATION OF WATER QUALITY CONTROL

In order to effectively protect beneficial uses, the Regional Water Board updates the Basin Plan regularly in response to changing water quality conditions. The Regional Water Board is periodically apprised of water quality problems in the Sacramento and San Joaquin River Basins, but the major review of water quality is done every three years as part of the Triennial Review of water quality standards.

During the triennial review, the Regional Water Board holds a public hearing to receive comments on actual and potential water quality problems. A workplan is prepared which identifies the control actions that will be implemented over the succeeding three years to address the problems. The actions may include or result in revision of the Basin Plan's water quality standards if that is an appropriate problem remedy. Until such time that a basin plan is revised, the triennial review also serves to reaffirm existing standards.

The control actions that are identified through the triennial review process are incorporated into the Basin Plan to meet requirements to describe actions (to achieve objectives) and a time schedule of their implementation as called for in the Water Code, Section 13242(a) and (b). The actions recommended in the most recent triennial review are described in the following section.

ACTIONS AND SCHEDULE TO ACHIEVE WATER QUALITY OBJECTIVES

The Regional Water Board expects to implement the actions identified below over the fiscal year (FY) period 1993/1994 through 1995/1996. The problems to which the actions respond were identified as a result of the Regional Water Board's 1993 Triennial Review. The actions and schedules assume that the Regional Water Board has available a close approximation of the mix and level of resources it

had in FY 1993/1994. The actions are identified by major water quality problem categories.

Agricultural Drainage Discharges in the San Joaquin River Basin

Water quality in the San Joaquin River has degraded significantly since the late 1940s. During this period, salt concentrations in the River, near Vernalis, have doubled. Concentrations of boron, selenium, molybdenum and other trace elements have also increased. These increases are primarily due to reservoir development on the east side tributaries and upper basin for agricultural development, the use of poorer quality, higher salinity, Delta water in lieu of San Joaquin River water on west side agricultural lands and drainage from upslope saline soils on the west side of the San Joaquin Valley. The water quality degradation in the River was identified in the 1975 Basin Plan and the Lower San Joaquin River was classified as a Water Quality Limited Segment. At that time, it was envisioned that a Valley-wide Drain would be developed and these subsurface drainage water flows would then be discharged outside the Basin, thus improving River water quality. However, present day development is looking more toward a regional solution to the drainage water discharge problem rather than a valley-wide drain.

Because of the need to manage salt and other pollutants in the River, the Regional Water Board began developing a Regional Drainage Water Disposal Plan for the Basin. The development began in FY 87/88 when Basin Plan amendments were considered by the Water Board in FY 88/89. The amendment development process included review of beneficial uses, establishment of water quality objectives, and preparation of a regulatory plan, including a full implementation plan. The regulatory plan emphasized achieving objectives through reductions in drainage volumes and pollutant loads through best management practices and other on-farm methods. Additional regulatory steps will be considered based on achievements of water quality goals and securing of adequate resources.

The amendment emphasized toxic elements in subsurface drainage discharges. The Regional Water Board however still recognizes salt management as the most serious long-term issue on the San Joaquin River. The Regional Water Board will continue as an active participant in the San Joaquin River Management Program implementation phase, as

authorized by AB 3048, to promote salinity management schemes including time discharge releases, real time monitoring and source control.

Per the amendment to the Basin Plan for San Joaquin River subsurface agricultural drainage, approved by the State Water Board in Resolution No. 96-078 and incorporated herein, the following actions will be implemented.

1. In developing control actions for selenium, the Regional Board will utilize a priority system which focuses on a combination of sensitivity of the beneficial use to selenium and the environmental benefit expected from the action.
2. Control actions which result in selenium load reduction are most effective in meeting water quality objectives.
3. With the uncertainty in the effectiveness of each control action, the regulatory program will be conducted as a series of short-term actions that are designed to meet long-term water quality objectives.
4. Best management practices, such as water conservation measures, are applicable to the control of agricultural subsurface drainage.
5. Performance goals will be used to measure progress toward achievement of water quality objectives for selenium. Prohibitions of discharge and waste discharge requirements will be used to control agricultural subsurface drainage discharges containing selenium. Compliance with performance goals and water quality objectives for nonpoint sources will occur no later than the dates specified in Table IV-4.
6. Waste discharge requirements will be used to control agricultural subsurface drainage discharges containing selenium and may be used to control discharges containing other toxic trace elements.
7. Selenium load reduction requirements will be incorporated into waste discharge requirements as effluent limits as necessary to ensure that the selenium water quality objectives in the San Joaquin River downstream of the Merced River inflow is achieved. The Board intends to implement a TMDL after public review.

Table IV-4. Compliance Time Schedule for Meeting the 4-day Average and Monthly Mean Water Quality Objective for Selenium

Selenium Water Quality Objectives (in bold) and Performance Goals (in italics)

Water Body/Water Year Type ¹	1 October 1996	1 October 2002	1 October 2005	1 October 2010
Salt Slough and Wetland Water Supply Channels listed in Appendix 40	2 µg/L monthly mean			
San Joaquin River below the Merced River; Above Normal and Wet Water Year types ¹		<i>5µg/L monthly mean</i>	5 µg/L 4-day avg.	
San Joaquin River below the Merced River; Critical, Dry, and Below Normal Water Year types		<i>8µg/L monthly mean</i>	<i>5 µg/L monthly mean</i>	5 µg/L 4-day avg.
Mud Slough (north) and the San Joaquin River from Sack Dam to the Merced River				5 µg/L 4-day avg.

¹ The water year classification will be established using the best available estimate of the 60-20-20 San Joaquin Valley water year hydrologic classification (as defined in Footnote 17 for Table 3 in the State Water Resources Control Board's *Water Quality Control Plan for the San Francisco Bay/Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta Estuary*, May 1995) at the 75% exceedance level using data from the Department of Water Resources Bulletin 120 series. The previous water year's classification will apply until an estimate is made of the current water year.

8. Selenium effluent limits established in waste discharge requirements will be applied to the discharge of subsurface drainage water from the Grassland watershed. In the absence of a regional entity to coordinate actions on the discharge, the Regional Board will consider setting the effluent limits at each drainage water source (discharger) to ensure that beneficial uses are protected at all points downstream.
9. Upslope irrigations and water facility operators whose actions contribute to subsurface drainage flows will participate in the program to control discharges.
10. Public and private managed-wetlands will participate in the program to achieve water quality objectives.
11. Achieving reductions in the load of selenium discharged is highly dependent upon the effectiveness of individual actions or technology not currently available; therefore, the Regional Board will review the waste discharge requirements and compliance schedule at least every 5 years.
12. All those discharging or contributing to the generation of agricultural subsurface drainage will be required to submit for approval a short-term (5-year) drainage management plan designed to meet interim milestones and a long-term drainage management plan designed to meet final water quality objectives.
13. An annual review of the effectiveness of control actions taken will be conducted by those contributing to the generation of agricultural subsurface drainage.
14. Evaporation basins in the San Joaquin Basin will be required to meet minimum design standards, have waste discharge requirements and be part of a regional plan to control agricultural subsurface drainage.
15. The Regional Board staff will coordinate with US EPA and the dischargers on a study plan to support the development of a site specific selenium water quality objective for the San Joaquin River and other effluent dominated waterbodies in the Grassland watershed.
16. The Regional Board will establish water quality objectives for salinity for the San Joaquin River.

Assessment of Biotoxicity of Major Point and Nonpoint Source Discharges in the Sacramento River and San Joaquin River Basins

In addition to numerical water quality objectives for toxicity, the Basin Plan contains a narrative water quality objective that requires all surface waters to "...be maintained free of toxic substances in concentrations that are toxic to or that produce detrimental physiological responses to human, plant, animal, and aquatic life." To check for compliance with this objective, the Regional Water Board initiated a biotoxicity monitoring program to assess toxic impacts from point and nonpoint sources in FY 86-87.

Toxicity testing monitoring requirements have been placed in NPDES permits, as appropriate. Since 1986-87, ambient toxicity testing (coupled with water quality chemistry to identify toxic constituents) has been concentrated in the Delta and major tributaries. The Regional Water Board will continue to impose toxicity testing monitoring requirements in NPDES permits. The focus of ambient toxicity testing will continue to be the Delta and major tributaries.

Heavy Metals From Point and Nonpoint Sources

Heavy metals such as copper, zinc, mercury, lead, and cadmium impair beneficial uses of surface streams. These metals result from various point and nonpoint sources throughout the region, including mines, urban runoff, agriculture, and wastewater treatment plants. Discharges from abandoned or inactive mines, particularly in the Sacramento River watershed, severely impair local receiving waters. Available information suggests that such mines are by far the largest contributors of copper, zinc, and cadmium to surface waters in the Sacramento and San Joaquin River Basins.

Because the Delta and San Francisco Bay receive all upstream inputs, the effects of heavy metals may be focused on these water bodies. Although the relationship between cause and effect remains unclear, heavy metals have been implicated as a cause of problems in Delta biota (e.g., there is a health advisory limiting the consumption of striped bass because of elevated levels of mercury) and copper objectives have been exceeded in the Bay. Problems in the Bay and Delta are related to the

effects of total metals loadings and dissolved metals concentrations.

The Regional Water Board plans to develop a mass emission strategy to control the loads of metals entering receiving waters and the Delta. Although the strategy will focus on control of discharges from inactive and abandoned mines, reasonable steps will also be taken to limit loads of metals from other significant sources. The Regional Water Board also plans to continue to monitor for metals in the Delta and principal tributaries to the Delta to assess compliance with water quality objectives, to assess impacts on beneficial uses, and to coordinate monitoring and metal reduction programs with the San Francisco Regional Water Quality Control Board.

Where circumstances warrant, the Regional Water Board will support action to clean up and abate pollution from identified sources. Funds from the State Water Pollution Cleanup and Abatement Account have been and are being used to clean up and abate discharges from selected abandoned or inactive mines. Abatement projects are underway at Iron Mountain Mine, Walker Mine, Mammoth Mine, Balaklala Mine, Keystone Mine, Stowell Mine, and Penn Mine, as data show that these mines are the most significant sources in terms of total metals discharged to receiving waters.

However, recent judicial decisions have imposed liability on the Regional Water Board for its cleanup actions at the Penn Mine. As long as the risk of such liability exists, the Regional Water Board will likely choose not to perform cleanup at any additional sites. Action by the State Legislature or the Congress will probably be required to resolve concerns of liability and facilitate the State's role in site remediation.

The Regional Water Board also will seek additional resources to update the Regional Abandoned Mines Inventory, to establish a monitoring program to track metals across the Delta and into the Bay, and to determine what loads the Delta can assimilate without resulting in adverse impacts. Although most of the significant mine portal discharges are in the process of being controlled, others need studies to determine their potential for cleanup. Since a major uncharacterized source of metals are the tailings piles associated with the mines, studies are needed to define the loads from these sources in order to establish priorities for abatement activities.

Mercury Discharges in the Sacramento River and San Joaquin River Basins

Mercury problems are evident region-wide. The main concern with mercury is that, like selenium, it bioaccumulates in aquatic systems to levels that are harmful to fish and their predators. Health advisories have been issued which recommend limiting consumption of fish taken from the Bay/Delta, Clear Lake, Lake Berryessa, and Marsh Creek Reservoir. Other water bodies approach or exceed National Academy of Science (NAS) and/or U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA) guidelines for wildlife and human protection, respectively. In addition to these concerns, fish-eating birds taken from some bodies of water in the Basins have levels of mercury that can be expected to cause toxic effects. Bird-kills from mercury also have been documented in Lake Berryessa. (There is also concern for birds in the Delta, but no studies have been completed.) The Regional Water Board has done a preliminary assessment of the mercury situation in the Central Valley Region and concluded that the problem is serious and remedies will be complex and expensive.

The short-term strategy is to concentrate on correcting problems at upstream sites while monitoring the Delta to see whether upstream control activities measurably benefit the Delta. The Regional Water Board will support efforts to fund the detailed studies necessary to define assimilative capacity and to fully define uptake mechanisms in the biota.

An abatement study was completed for Clear Lake in 1990. The study identified abatement measures at Sulfur Bank Mine that are now being implemented as part of a USEPA superfund project. In the next few years monitoring is scheduled to be done in the Delta and at upstream sources. The Regional Water Board will continue to support efforts to study how mercury is cycled through the Delta and to further characterize upstream sources.

Pesticide Discharges from Nonpoint Sources

The control of pesticide discharges to surface waters from nonpoint sources will be achieved primarily by the development and implementation of management practices that minimize or eliminate the amount discharged. The Board will use water quality monitoring results to evaluate the effectiveness of control efforts and to help prioritize control efforts.

Regional Board monitoring will consist primarily of chemical analysis and biotoxicity testing of major water bodies receiving irrigation return flows. The focus will be on pesticides with use patterns and chemical characteristics that indicate a high probability of entering surface waters at levels that may impact beneficial uses. Board staff will advise other agencies that conduct water quality and aquatic biota monitoring of high priority chemicals, and will review monitoring data developed by these agencies. Review of the impacts of "inert" ingredients contained in pesticide formulations will be integrated into the Board's pesticide monitoring program.

When a pesticide is detected more than once in surface waters, investigations will be conducted to identify sources. Priority for investigation will be determined through consideration of the following factors: toxicity of the compound, use patterns and the number of detections. These investigations may be limited to specific watersheds where the pesticide is heavily used or local practices result in unusually high discharges. Special studies will also be conducted to determine pesticide content of sediment and aquatic life when conditions warrant. Other agencies will be consulted regarding prioritization of monitoring projects, protocol, and interpretation of results.

To ensure that new pesticides do not create a threat to water quality, the Board, either directly or through the State Water Resources Control Board, will review the pesticides that are processed through the Department of Food and Agriculture's (DFA) registration program. Where use of the pesticide may result in a discharge to surface waters, the Board staff will make efforts to ensure that label instructions or use restrictions require management practices that will result in compliance with water quality objectives. When the Board determines that despite any actions taken by DFA, use of the pesticide may result in discharge to surface waters in violation of the objectives, the Board will take regulatory action, such as adoption of a prohibition of discharge or issuance of waste discharge requirements to control discharges of the pesticide. Monitoring may be required to verify that management practices are effective in protecting water quality.

The Board will notify pesticide dischargers through public notices, educational programs and the Department of Food and Agriculture's pesticide regulatory program of the water quality objectives related to pesticide discharges. Dischargers will be advised to implement management practices that result in full compliance with these objectives by 1

January 1993, unless required to do so earlier. (Dischargers of carbofuran, malathion, methyl parathion, molinate and thiobencarb must meet the requirements detailed in the Prohibitions section.) During this time period, dischargers will remain legally responsible for the impacts caused by their discharges.

The Board will conduct reviews of the management practices being followed to verify that they produce discharges that comply with water quality objectives. It is anticipated that practices associated with one or two pesticides can be reviewed each year. Since criteria, control methods and other factors are subject to change, it is also anticipated that allowable management practices will change over time, and control practices for individual pesticides will have to be reevaluated periodically.

Public hearings will be held at least once every two years to review the progress of the pesticide control program. At these hearings, the Board will

- review monitoring results and identify pesticides of greatest concern,
- review changes or trends in pesticide use that may impact water quality,
- consider approval of proposed management practices for the control of pesticide discharges,
- set the schedule for reviewing management practices for specific pesticides, and
- consider enforcement action.

After reviewing the testimony, the Board will place the pesticides into one of the following three classifications. When compliance with water quality objectives and performance goals is not obtained within the timeframes allowed, the Board will consider alternate control options, such as prohibition of discharge or issuance of waste discharge requirements.

1. Where the Board finds that pesticide discharges pose a significant threat to drinking water supplies or other beneficial uses, it will request DFA to act to prevent further impacts. If DFA does not proceed with such action(s) within six months of the Board's request, the Board will act within a reasonable time period to place restrictions on the discharges.

2. Where the Board finds that currently used discharge management practices are resulting in violations of water quality objectives, but the impacts of the discharge are not so severe as to require immediate changes, dischargers will be given three years, with a possibility of three one year time extensions depending on the circumstances involved, to develop and implement practices that will meet the objectives. During this period of time, dischargers may be required to take interim steps, such as meeting Board established performance goals to reduce impacts of the discharges. Monitoring will be required to show that the interim steps and proposed management practices are effective.
3. The Board may approve the management practices as adequate to meet water quality objectives. After the Board has approved specific management practices for the use and discharge of a pesticide, no other management practice may be used until it has been reviewed by the Board and found to be equivalent to or better than previously approved practices. Waste discharge requirements will be waived for irrigation return water per Resolution No. 82-036 if the Board determines that the management practices are adequate to meet water quality objectives and meet the conditions of the waiver policy. Enforcement action may be taken against those who do not follow management practices approved by the Board.

Carbofuran, malathion, methyl parathion, molinate and thiobencarb have been detected in surface waters at levels that impact aquatic organisms. Review of management practices associated with these materials is under way and is expected to continue for at least another two years. A timetable of activities related to these pesticides is at the end of the Prohibitions section. A detailed assessment of the impacts of these pesticides on aquatic organisms is also being conducted and water quality objectives will be adopted for these materials by the State or Regional Board by the end of 1993.

In conducting a review of pesticide monitoring data, the Board will consider the cumulative impact if more than one pesticide is present in the water body. This will be done by initially assuming that the toxicities of pesticides are additive. This will be evaluated separately for each beneficial use using the following formula:

$$\frac{C_1}{O_1} + \frac{C_2}{O_2} + \dots + \frac{C_i}{O_i} = S$$

Where:

- C = The concentration of each pesticide.
- O = The water quality objective or criterion for the specific beneficial use for each pesticide present, based on the best available information. Note that the numbers must be acceptable to the Board and performance goals are not to be used in this equation.
- S = The sum. A sum exceeding one (1.0) indicates that the beneficial use may be impacted.

The above formula will not be used if it is determined that it does not apply to the pesticides being evaluated. When more than one pesticide is present, the impacts may not be cumulative or they may be additive, synergistic or antagonistic. A detailed assessment of the pesticides involved must be conducted to determine the exact nature of the impacts.

For most pesticides, numerical water quality objectives have not been adopted. USEPA criteria and other guidance are also extremely limited. Since this situation is not likely to change in the near future, the Board will use the best available technical information to evaluate compliance with the narrative objectives. Where valid testing has developed 96 hour LC50 values for aquatic organisms (the concentration that kills one half of the test organisms in 96 hours), the Board will consider one tenth of this value for the most sensitive species tested as the upper limit (daily maximum) for the protection of aquatic life. Other available technical information on the pesticide (such as Lowest Observed Effect Concentrations and No Observed Effect Levels), the water bodies and the organisms involved will be evaluated to determine if lower concentrations are required to meet the narrative objectives.

To ensure the best possible program, the Board will coordinate its pesticide control efforts with other agencies and organizations. Wherever possible, the burdens on pesticide dischargers will be reduced by working through the DFA or other appropriate regulatory processes. The Board may also designate another agency or organization as the responsible party for the development and/or implementation of management practices, but it will retain overall

review and control authority. The Board will work with water agencies and others whose activities may influence pesticide levels to minimize concentrations in surface waters.

Since the discharge of pesticides into surface waters will be allowed under certain conditions, the Board will take steps to ensure that this control program is conducted in compliance with the federal and state antidegradation policies. This will primarily be done as pesticide discharges are evaluated on a case by case basis.

Dredging in the Sacramento River and San Joaquin River Basins

Large volumes of sediment are transported in the waters of the Sacramento and San Joaquin Rivers which drain the Central Valley. The average annual sediment load to San Francisco Bay from these two rivers is estimated to be 8 million cubic yards. Dredging and riverbank protection projects are ongoing, continuing activities necessary to keep ship channels open, prevent flooding, and control riverbank erosion. The Delta, with over 700 miles of waterways, is a major area of activity. At present, the Corps is overseeing the conduct and planning of rehabilitation work along 165 miles of levees surrounding 15 Delta islands. In addition, virtually all of the Delta levees have been upgraded by island owners or reclamation districts. The magnitude of recent operations, such as the Stockton and Sacramento Ship Channel Deepening Projects and Sacramento River Bank Protection Project, is discussed in recent U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Reports. For example, the Corps removes over 10 million cubic yards of sediment yearly from the Sacramento River. If the Sacramento River Deep Water Ship Channel is widened and deepened as proposed currently, 25 million cubic yards of bottom material will be removed from the river during the 5-year project.

Environmental impacts of dredging operations and materials disposal include temporary dissolved oxygen reduction, increased turbidity and, under certain conditions, the mobilization of toxic chemicals and release of biostimulatory substances from the sediments. The direct destruction and burial of spawning gravels and alteration of benthic habitat may be the most severe impacts. The existing regulatory process must be consistently implemented to assure protection of water quality and compliance with the certification requirements of Section 401 of the Federal Clean Water Act.

The Regional Water Board continues to work with dredging interests in the San Francisco Bay and Delta to develop a long term management strategy (LTMS) for handling dredge spoils. We will adopt requirements for all significant dredging operations and upland disposal projects in the Region.

Nitrate Pollution of Ground Water in the Sacramento and San Joaquin River Basins

Since 1980, over 200 municipal supply wells have been closed in the Central Valley because of nitrate levels exceeding the State's 45 mg/l drinking water standard. Proposals have been submitted to assess the extent of the problem and explore possible regulatory responses, but without success. The increasing population growth in the Valley is expected to accelerate the problem's occurrence in the years ahead.

The Regional Water Board considers nitrate pollution to be a critical issue for beneficial use protection in the Central Valley Region. Staff will continue efforts to obtain study funds. Since nitrate pollution of ground water is not restricted to the Central Valley Region, the Regional Water Board recommends the State Water

Board take the lead in developing programs for controlling ground water contamination resulting from the use of nitrogen fertilizer on irrigated crops.

Temperature and Turbidity Increases Below Large Water Storage and Diversion Projects in the Sacramento River Basin

The storage and diversion of water for hydroelectric and other purposes can impact downstream beneficial uses because of changes in temperature and the introduction of turbidity. There are several large facilities in the Basin which have had a history of documented or suspected downstream impairments.

Where problems have been identified, the staff will work with operators to prepare management agency agreements or make recommendations to State Water Board regarding requirements to remedy the problems. Where problems are suspected, the staff will seek additional monitoring.

Beneficial Use Impairments from Logging, Construction, and Associated Activities

The Regional Water Board has regulatory responsibility to prevent adverse water quality impacts from timber harvest activities. Impacts usually consist of temperature and turbidity effects caused by logging and associated activities in or next to streams. There has been an increase in the level of harvesting on private lands which is partly due to limited logging on federal lands. The staff participates on an interagency review team and performs a limited number of field inspections, both before and after harvest, in an attempt to obtain compliance with and enforce best management practices. The Regional Water Board may initiate enforcement action where water quality is degraded or threatened, but the volume of harvest plans annually submitted for review (e.g. approximately 800 in 1994) and the geographical spread (logging occurs in more than 20 counties in the Region) results in high probability of staff not being aware of timber operations which cause problems. Limited staff time also precludes substantive interchange with Department of Forestry and timber industry personnel during the planning phase of a timber operation. This interchange would lead to more timely identification of water quality concerns and development of appropriate mitigations.

Regional Water Board staff will continue to participate in weekly interagency review team meetings as well as pre-harvest and post-harvest inspections. Because of changes in the Forest Practice Rules, timber harvest plans have become more complicated and require more time for review than in the past. Furthermore, there has been an increase in the level of harvesting on private lands partly due to the limited logging on federal lands. Watersheds with the potential to be designated "special watersheds" need to be monitored and assessed. Due to the increased demands on staff time, staff will pursue additional funding for this task.

Dairies

The majority of the 1600+ dairies in the region are not regulated by waste discharge requirements and there is insufficient staff to conduct inspections on a regular basis to determine if the facilities are operating in compliance with applicable regulations. Based on information obtained during complaint

investigations and aerial surveillance flights, however, it is apparent that many of the facilities are following practices that may adversely impact water quality. Regional Water Board studies have shown that dairies have impacted ground water quality in some areas.

As part of a project funded by basin planning update funds, staff has been evaluating alternative approaches to obtaining improved water quality protection at dairy sites. Upon completion of the staff report, workshops will be held and the Regional Water Board will consider changes in the regulatory program for dairies.

One of the primary concerns is the impact of dairies on ground water quality. As part of the basin planning project, shallow monitoring wells have been installed at five facilities that are following what are currently the best management practices for protection of ground water quality. Data from these sites will be used to help determine if improved management practices must be developed.

Nutrient and Pesticide Discharges From Nurseries

The majority of the over 500 nurseries in the region are not regulated by waste discharge requirements. Staff experience with the few nurseries that are regulated has shown that tailwater discharges from nurseries have the potential to impact water quality. A typical nursery irrigates at least once per day, and applies fertilizer through the irrigation system. Pesticides are applied as needed. Excess tailwater usually flows off the property, either into a sewer system, a surface waterway, or an infiltration pond.

As part of a project supported by basin planning update funds, staff conducted a nine-month sampling program at four typical nurseries. Upon completion of the report summarizing the sampling project, staff will work with industry representatives, the State Water Board, and the Department of Pesticide Regulation (DPR) to develop any needed best management practices. The Memorandum of Understanding between the State Water Board and DPR describing the role of each agency with regard to pesticide regulation is Appendix item 20.

ESTIMATED COSTS OF AGRICULTURAL WATER QUALITY CONTROL PROGRAMS AND POTENTIAL SOURCES OF FINANCING

California Cooperative Extension Service and the
U.S.D.A. Soil Conservation Service.

San Joaquin River Subsurface Agricultural Drainage Control Program

The estimates of capital and operational costs to achieve the selenium objective for the San Joaquin River range from \$3.6 million/year to \$27.4 million/year (1990 dollars). The cost of meeting water quality objectives in Mud Slough (north), Salt Slough, and the wetland supply channels is approximately \$2.7 million /year (1990 dollars).

Potential funding sources include:

1. Private financing by individual sources.
2. Bonded indebtedness or loans from governmental institutions.
3. Surcharge on water deliveries to lands contributing to the drainage problem.
4. Ad Valorem tax on lands contributing to the drainage problem.
5. Taxes and fees levied by a district created for the purpose of drainage management.
6. State or federal grants or low-interest loan programs.
7. Single-purpose appropriations from federal or State legislative bodies (including land retirement programs).

Pesticide Control Program

Based on an average of \$15 per acre per year for 500,000 acres of land planted to rice and an average of \$5 per acre per year for the remaining 3,500,000 acres of irrigated agriculture in the Sacramento and San Joaquin River Basins, the total annual cost to agriculture is estimated at \$25,000,000. Financial assistance for complying with this program may be obtainable through the U.S.D.A. Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service and technical assistance is available from the University of

IMPLEMENTATION

IV-38.00

1 September 1998

V. SURVEILLANCE AND MONITORING

This chapter describes the methods and programs that the Regional Water Board uses to acquire water quality information. Acquisition of data is a basic need of a water quality control program and is required by both the Clean Water Act and the Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act.

The Regional Water Board's surveillance and monitoring efforts include different types of sample collection and analysis. Surface water surveillance may involve analyses of water, sediment, or tissue samples and ground water surveillance often includes collection and analysis of soil samples. Soil, water, and sediment samples are analyzed via standard, EPA approved, laboratory methods. The Regional Water Board addresses quality assurance through bid specifications and individual sampling actions such as submittal of split, duplicate, or spiked samples and lab inspections.

Although surveillance and monitoring efforts have traditionally relied upon measurement of key chemical/physical parameters (e.g., metals, organic and inorganic compounds, bacteria, temperature, and dissolved oxygen) as indicators of water quality, there is increasing recognition that close approximation of water quality impacts requires the use of biological indicators. This is particularly true for regulation of toxic compounds in surface waters where standard physical/chemical measurement may be inadequate to indicate the wide range of substances and circumstances able to cause toxicity to aquatic organisms. The use of biological indicators to identify or measure toxic discharges is often referred to as *biotoxicity testing*. EPA has issued guidelines and technical support materials for biotoxicity testing. A key use of the method is to monitor for compliance with narrative water quality objectives or permit requirements that specify that there is to be no discharge of toxic materials in toxic amounts. The Regional Water Board will continue to use biotoxicity procedures and testing in its surveillance and monitoring program.

As discussed previously, the protection, attainment, and maintenance of beneficial uses occur as part of a continuing cycle of identifying beneficial use impairments, applying control measures, and assessing program effectiveness. The Regional Water Board surveillance and monitoring program provides for the collection, analysis, and distribution of the water quality data needed to sustain its control

program. Under ideal circumstances, the Regional Water Board surveillance and monitoring program would produce information on the frequency, duration, source, extent, and severity of beneficial use impairments. In attempting to meet this goal, the Regional Water Board relies upon a variety of measures to obtain information. The current surveillance and monitoring program consists primarily of seven elements:

Data Collected by Other Agencies

The Regional Water Board relies on data collected by a variety of other agencies. For example, the Department of Water Resources (DWR) has an ongoing monitoring program in the Delta and the United States Geological Survey (USGS) and DWR conduct monitoring in some upstream rivers. The Department of Fish and Game, Fish and Wildlife Service, USGS, and Department of Health Services also conduct special studies and collect data.

Regional Water Board and State Water Board Monitoring Programs

The State Water Board manages its own Toxic Substances Monitoring (*TSM*) program to collect and analyze fish tissue for the presence of bioaccumulative chemicals. The Regional Water Board participates in the selection of sampling sites for its basins and annually is provided with a report of the testing results.

Special Studies

Intensive water quality studies provide detailed data to locate and evaluate violations of receiving water standards and to make waste load allocations. They usually involve localized, frequent and/or continuous sampling. These studies are specially designed to evaluate problems in potential water quality limited segments, areas of special biological significance or hydrologic units requiring sampling in addition to the routine collection efforts.

One such study is the *San Joaquin River Subsurface Agricultural Drainage Monitoring Program*. The program includes the following tasks:

1. The dischargers will monitor discharge points and receiving waters for constituents of concern and flow (discharge points and receiving water points).

2. The Regional Board will inspect discharge flow monitoring facilities and will continue its cooperative effort with dischargers to ensure the quality of laboratory results.
3. The Regional Board will, on a regular basis, inspect any facilities constructed to store or treat agricultural subsurface drainage.
4. The Regional Board will continue to maintain and update its information on agricultural subsurface drainage facilities in the Grassland watershed. Efforts at collecting basic data on all facilities, including flow estimates and water quality will continue.
5. The Regional Water Board, in cooperation with other agencies, will regularly assess water conservation achievements, cost of such efforts and drainage reduction effectiveness information. In addition, in cooperation with the programs of other agencies and local district managers, the Regional Board will gather information on irrigation practices, i.e., irrigation efficiency, pre-irrigation efficiency, excessive deep percolation and on seepage losses.

Aerial Surveillance

Low-altitude flights are conducted primarily to observe variations in field conditions, gather photographic records of discharges, and document variations in water quality.

Self-Monitoring

Self-monitoring reports are normally submitted by the discharger on a monthly or quarterly basis as required by the permit conditions. They are routinely reviewed by Regional Water Board staff.

Compliance Monitoring

Compliance monitoring determines permit compliance, validates self-monitoring reports, and provides support for enforcement actions. Discharger compliance monitoring and enforcement actions are the responsibility of the Regional Water Board staff.

Complaint Investigation

Complaints from the public or governmental agencies regarding the discharge of pollutants or creation of nuisance conditions are investigated and pertinent information collected.

A P P E N D I X

APPENDIX DIRECTORY

<u>ITEM*</u>	<u>DESCRIPTION</u>
1.	State Water Board Policy for Water Quality Control
2.	State Water Board Resolution No. 68-16, Statement of Policy with Respect to Maintaining High Quality of Waters in California
3.	State Water Board Resolution No. 74-43, Water Quality Control Policy for the Enclosed Bays and Estuaries of California
4.	State Water Board Resolution No. 75-58, Water Quality Control Policy on the Use and Disposal of Inland Waters Used for Powerplant Cooling
5.	State Water Board Resolution No. 77-1, Policy with Respect to Water Reclamation in California
6.	State Water Board Resolution No. 87-22, Policy on the Disposal of Shredder Waste
7.	State Water Board Resolution No. 88-23, Policy Regarding the Underground Storage Tank Pilot Program
8.	State Water Board Resolution No. 88-63, Sources of Drinking Water Policy
9.	State Water Board Resolution No. 92-49, Policies and Procedures for Investigation and Cleanup and Abatement of Discharges Under Water Code Section 13304
10.	State Water Board Resolution No. 93-62, Policy for Regulation of Discharges of Municipal Solid Waste
11.	State Water Board Water Quality Control Plan for Temperature in Coastal and Inerstate Waters and Enclosed Bays and Estuaries in California (Thermal Plan)
12.	State Water Board Resolution No. 92-82, exception to the Thermal Plan for Sacramento Regional County Sanitation District
13.	State Water Board MAA with Forest Service, U. S. Department of Agriculture
14.	State Water Board MOA with Department of Health Services (implementation of hazardous waste program)
15.	State Water Board MOA with Department of Health Services (use of reclaimed water)
16.	State Water Board MAA with the Board of Forestry and California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection
17.	State Water Board MOA with CA Department of Conservation, Division of Oil and Gas

* Appendix items are paginated by: item number/item page/item total pages

APPENDIX DIRECTORY (continued)

<u>ITEM*</u>	<u>DESCRIPTION</u>
18.	State Water Board MOU with Department of Health Services/Department of Toxic Substances Control
19.	State Water Board MOU with Soil Conservation Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture for Planning and Technical Assistance Related to Water Quality Policies and Activities
20.	State Water Board MOU with the Environmental Affairs Agency, Air Resources Board, and California Integrated Waste Management Board
21.	State Water Board MOU with the California Department of Pesticide Regulation for the Protection of Water Quality from Potentially Adverse Effects of Pesticides
22.	State Water Board MOU with Several Agencies Regarding the Implementation of the San Joaquin Valley Drainage Program's Recommended Plan
23.	State Water Board MOU with the California Integrated Waste Management Board
24.	State Water Board MOU with the Bureau of Land Management US Department of Interior - Nonpoint Source Issues, Planning and Coordination of Nonpoint Source Water Quality Policies and Activities
25.	Regional Water Board Resolution No. 70-118, Delegation of Certain Duties and Powers of the Regional Water Board to the Board's Executive Officer
26.	Regional Water Board MOU with U.S. Bureau of Land Management (Ukiah District)
27.	Regional Water Board MOU with U.S. Bureau of Land Management (Susanville District)
28.	Regional Water Board MOU with U.S. Bureau of Land Management (Bakersfield District)
29.	Regional Water Board MOA with U. S. Bureau of Reclamation
30.	Regional Water Board MOU with California Dept. of Fish and Game and Mosquito Abatement and Vector Control Districts of the South San Joaquin Valley Regarding Vegetation Management in Wastewater Treatment Facilities
31.	Regional Water Board Resolution No. 89-247, Conditional Waiver of Waste Discharge Requirements at Retail Fertilizer Facilities
32.	Regional Water Board Resolution No. 90-34, Conditional Waiver of Waste Discharge Requirements at Pesticide Applicator Facilities
33.	Regional Water Board Guidelines for Winery Waste

* Appendix items are paginated by: item number/item page/item total pages

APPENDIX DIRECTORY (continued)

<u>ITEM*</u>	<u>DESCRIPTION</u>
34.	Regional Water Board Guidelines for Erosion
35.	Regional Water Board Guidelines for Small Hydroelectric Facilities
36.	Regional Water Board Guidelines for Disposal from Land Developments
37.	Regional Water Board Guidelines for Mining
38.	Regional Water Board list of Water Quality Limited Segments
39.	Federal Anti-degradation policy (40 CFR 131.12)
40.	Grassland Watershed Wetland Channels

* Appendix items are paginated by: item number/item page/item total pages